FOREIGN
BROADCAST
INFORMATION
SERVICE

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-207
Tuesday
27 October 1987

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-87-207 *27 October 1987*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Chervov Announces Missile Agreement Terms *[East Berlin Voice of GDR]* 1

COMMUNIST RELATIONS

CEMA Session Decisions Approved *[PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 2
CEMA Engineering Body Ends Meeting 2
Bessmertnikh Informs Envoys on Talks 2
Communist, Workers Parties Salute USSR 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events *[Prozhogin, 25 Oct]* 4
Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' *[Levin, Zhurkin, Shishlin]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

More on Shevardnadze News Conference on Talks *[PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 11
Shevardnadze, Matlock Meet 27 October 16
Commentaries, Reaction to U.S.-USSR Talks 16
Ponomarev's View *[KRASNAYA ZVEVDA 25 Oct]* 16
PRAVDA's Zhukov Cited *[26 Oct]* 18
Chernyshev Comments 19
Zholkver: 'First Step' 20
Shishlin Interviewed *[Prague]* 20
Shultz Evaluation 21
Reagan's Comments Noted 21
U.S. Carries Out 13th 1987 Nuclear Blast 22
U.S. Launches Titan Booster Rocket 26 Oct 22
Reagan Cited on Stock Market, Gulf, SDI 22
Oakley, XINHUA on Silkworm Supplies to Iran 23
U.S. 'Neoglobalist Doctrine' at Work in Gulf *[Pogodon]* 23

China

USSR-U.S. Arms Accord Welcomed *[Kuchin]* 24
Shevardnadze Receives PRC Ambassador 24
13th CPC Congress Discusses Main Report 25
U.S. Pressure Over Arms to Iran 25
More Attention to Combating Bureaucracy *[PRAVDA 23 Oct]* 25
Armed Forces Rectification Campaign *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* 26

Near East & South Asia

Status of Middle East Conference Assessed *[B. Shabayev]* 26
U.S. Cruise-Armed Nuclear Subs in Gulf *[PRAVDA 26 Oct]* 27
Vorontsov Interviewed on Ties With Egypt *[Cairo AL-MUSAWWAR 23 Oct]* 27
Kapitsa Received by Egyptian Officials *[IZVESTIYA 25 Oct]* 31
Anniversary of Aswan High Dam Noted *[IZVESTIYA 23 Oct]* 31
Government Delegation Leaves for Damascus 32
Soviet Official on U.S. Attack on Iran *[Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I 22 Oct]* 32

Najibullah Message on UN Day Cited 32
Success of DRA Conciliation Drive Assessed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 14 Oct]* 32
Correspondent Reports Qandahar Situation 37
Letters of Soldier Killed in DRA Published 38

East Europe

Projected Polish Economic Reforms Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 15 Oct]* 38
Ligachev, PZPR's Baryla on Construction 40
CPSU Leaders Address PZPR Functionaries 40
Dep Premier Silayev Receives SFRY Visitor *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 24 Oct]* 40
Yazov Greets Romanian Defense Minister *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* 40
Albanian Youth Union Congress Held *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 40
Hungarian Private Bond Fundraising Plan 41
GDR Warships End Visit to Leningrad *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]* 41
Nechayev Heads Delegation to Bulgaria *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Oct]* 41
Shalayev, Delegation Depart for Bucharest 41
Black Sea Sailors Arrive at SFRY Port 41

West Europe

EC Envoys Briefed on Soviet, U.S. Talks 42
FRG's Kohl Welcomes INF 'Breakthrough' *[PRAVDA 16 Oct]* 42
FRG Ambassador Received by Soviet Officials 43
Meets With Shevardnadze 43
Talks to Vorotnikov 43
Gromyko Receives Italian Peace Group 43
Churches Play Peace Role 43
Visiting Swedish Air Force Head Interviewed 44

Latin America & Caribbean

Central American Peace Settlement Assessed *[PRAVDA 12 Oct]* 45
U.S. 'Interference' in Guatemala Deal Noted *[V. Vinogradov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Oct]* 46
Reagan Meets With Honduran President Azcona *[PRAVDA 23 Oct]* 47
Peruvian President Garcia Interviewed 47

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political and Social

Shevardnadze Speaks At Foreign Ministry
[VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSSR No 2] 51
Ministers' Council Meets on Plan Fulfillment *[PRAVDA 24 Oct 87]* 55
More on TV Screening of Movie 'Risk' 57
Director Interviewed *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 25 Oct]* 57
'Truth' about Stalin Noted 59
IZVESTIYA Chief's Warning on Restructuring *[DPA]* 60
GOSR Center Opens; Gorbachev To Speak 2 Nov 60
New Issue of KOMMUNIST Viewed *[PRAVDA 15 Oct]* 61
Pre-Anniversary Press 'Looks Matter-of-Fact' 61
Ulyanovsk Restructuring Conference Held *[PRAVDA 11 Oct]* 62
'Increase in Openness' of 1977 Constitution *[Ambartsumov in MOSCOW NEWS 4 Oct]* 62
Azerbaijani Writer on Glasnost, Nationalism *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 Oct]* 63
Need To Combat Bureaucracy Cited *[PRAVDA 8 Oct]* 67
Latvian Meeting on International Education *[SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA 6 Oct]* 68
Kaliningrad Obkom Discusses Rural Problems *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Oct]* 72
Commission Debates Baykal Ecological Ills *[IZVESTIYA 7 Oct]* 74
Northern Kuriles Volcano Erupts 76
Vladivostok Seminar Views Philosophy Program *[Bratchikov in PRAVDA 2 Oct]* 76
Kirov's Civil War Action Commemorated *[PRAVDA 6 Oct]* 76

BRIEFS: 77
New CPSU History 77

Economic

Batalin, Silayev Visit Ulyanovsk Project *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Oct]* 77
Silayev at Signing of Cold Plant Deal *[PRAVDA 14 Oct]* 77
Long-Term, High-Interest Bonds *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 14 Oct]* 78
Changes in Statistics Work Outlined *[EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA No 42]* 78
Larger Role for Cooperative System Urged *[IZVESTIYA 3 Oct]* 80

Chervov Announces Missile Agreement Terms

LD271543 East Berlin Voice of GDR Domestic Service in German 1500 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Soviet Colonel General Chervov has confirmed that the Soviet-U.S. agreement on the removal of medium-range missiles is in fact ready. He gave details of the text of the treaty for the first time to GDR radio. They were agreed, Chervov said, that all medium-range and operational-tactical missiles would be eradicated in periods of 3 and 1 and 1/2 years, respectively. Everything would be carried out under strict and precise controls. During the destruction of the missiles representatives of the other party to the treaty are to be present. The Soviet Union had decided to blow up a large part of its missiles and to destroy only a small part by blind launchings without warheads. The United States of America had chosen destruction by burning the solid fuel. According to Chervov, each side will dispose of the fissionable material in its own warheads. The USSR is planning to use this material for energy production after appropriate processing.

CEMA Session Decisions Approved
PM261029 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 87 Second Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "At the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have examined the results of the 43d (Extraordinary) CEMA Session held in Moscow and approved the activity of the Soviet delegation headed by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at that session.

It was noted that the CEMA session's decisions adopted to implement the accords reached during the working meeting of leaders of the CEMA members' communist and workers parties in November last year provide a foundation for the purposeful work of all the community countries in restructuring the mechanism of socialist economic integration in CEMA's activity in the interests of making broad use of the advantages of socialism, enhancing the effectiveness of the fraternal countries' cooperation, and accelerating their socioeconomic development.

In accordance with the session's resolution, the forthcoming elaboration of collective documents determining the long-term directions of the international socialist division of labor as well as of multifaceted cooperation among the European CEMA members and the SRV, Cuba, and Mongolia is of fundamental importance for resolving the tasks facing the socialist community countries. The efficient use of the reserves of integrated collaboration is promoted by the session's line of intensifying the role of economic methods in the development of economic ties between fraternal states and the extensive involvement of enterprises and associations in cooperation.

The CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers have adopted a resolution which defines the tasks facing Soviet ministries and other organizations in implementing the session's decisions in conjunction with the radical reform of national economic management that is being conducted in the USSR. They envisage the further deepening of integration ties with the socialist countries and the strengthening of the responsibility of party, state, and economic organizations for the fulfillment of the Soviet side's commitments. Additional measures have also been planned with the aim of improving the work of Soviet organizations in fulfilling the Comprehensive Program for the CEMA Countries' Scientific and Technical Progress.

Viewing cooperation with the socialist countries as a most important priority of the CPSU and Soviet state's policy, the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers expressed the confidence that the practical implementation of the CEMA session's collective decisions will promote the further progress of the processes of restructuring and renewal, the improvement of socialism, and the strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the socialist community.

CEMA Engineering Body Ends Meeting
LD241030 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1154 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Lvov, 23 Oct (TASS)—The 73d session of the CEMA Permanent Commission for Cooperation in the sphere of Power Engineering finished its work here today. Delegations from the people's Republic of Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic, the GDR, Cuba, the Mongolian People's Republic, the Socialist Republic of Romania, the USSR, the CSSR, and the SFRY discussed the tasks ensuing from the decisions made at the 43d (Extraordinary) CEMA Session and the last meetings of the Council's Executive Committee pertaining to power production. Special attention was paid to the question of the readiness of national grids and the central electricity control administration of the unified power grids for the 1987-88 fall and winter periods. The course of the implementation of comprehensive programs of scientific and technical progress and the rational use of material resources up to the year 2000 was also examined. The meeting participants exchanged opinions on environmental protection problems. The respective decisions were made on the questions examined.

Bessmertnikh Informs Envoys on Talks
LD262028 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 26 Oct 87

[From the "Vremya" newscast; announcer-read report]

[Text] Today USSR Deputy Foreign Minister Bessmertnikh met the ambassadors and charge d'affaires of Bulgaria, Vietnam, Hungary, the GDR, the DPRK, Cuba, Mongolia, Poland, Romania, and Czechoslovakia. The heads of these diplomatic missions were informed in detail on the progress and the content of the talks that took place in Moscow between Comrade Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. Particular attention was paid to the major new initiatives introduced by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev during his talk with George Shultz.

It was stated that the consistent line pursued by the Soviet Union in its relations with the United States corresponds to the interests of the socialist states and all countries of the world.

Communist, Workers Parties Salute USSR
LD240501 Moscow TASS in English 1943 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Athens October 23 TASS—The third meeting of the communist and workers parties of the eastern Mediterranean, the Near and Middle East, and the Red Sea area has come to a close here.

The documents which were unanimously approved by the participants in the meeting included a statement on the occasion of the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia.

"The October Revolution", the statement points out, "became a major event of the 20th century which ushered in a new era in mankind's history. The revolution promoted the development of the world working-class movement and was of decisive importance for the formation of communist and workers parties, and inspired national liberation movements".

"The reorganization process which is now under way in the Soviet Union", the statement goes on, "is the source of strength and inspiration for the working class and the forces of democracy and social progress in various countries. It helps to enhance the impact of the ideas of socialism in the world. The reorganization process is inseparably connected with the Soviet Union's efforts to assert the new political thinking in international relations".

"The proposals voiced from the rostrum of the 27th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union (CPSU) to establish a comprehensive system of international security as well as the statement dated January 15, 1986, by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on the elimination nuclear, chemical and other types of weapons of mass destruction by the year 2000 are initiatives which inspire and mobilize peace forces throughout the world to struggle for the establishment of lasting peace on earth".

"Celebrating the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, we pay a tribute of respect to the party of the Bolsheviks and to great Lenin who accomplished this victorious revolution", the statement emphasized.

"We greet the Soviet people and their go-ahead vanguard—the CPSU. We wish them great successes in the new phase of the revolutionary movement which was ushered in by the Great October Socialist Revolution in the name of triumph of socialism, the happiness of the Soviet people, and the assertion of peace throughout the world", the statement says in conclusion.

Those present also adopted messages of solidarity with the struggle of the peoples of Nicaragua and South Africa as well as a statement on the situation in the Persian Gulf.

The meeting became an important stage in strengthening the fraternal parties' unity of action in the fight for peace, for improvement of the international situation, and for the establishment of a just international economic order.

PRAVDA Review of Week's International Events

PM261437 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 Second Edition p 5

["International Review" Column by Nikolay Prozhogin]

[Text] News From Moscow [subhead]

This week's biggest event in international life, though its significance of course transcends the bounds of this short time on the calendar, took place at the end of the week in Moscow.

On Friday 23 October in the Kremlin M.S. Gorbachev received U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, who had come to hold talks with USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze. The conversation in the Kremlin, lasting 5 hours in all, was devoted to the most important aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and international politics. The process of the galvanization of Soviet-U.S. relations, which are of tremendous importance for the general political atmosphere in the world, can be judged from the published report on the conversation.

Looking back—over the road from Geneva via Reykjavik, where a genuine breakthrough ensuring an upswing in the development of Soviet-U.S. dialogue was achieved—it can be stated that much has been done in this time. The dialogue that has begun between our countries, the contacts at summit level, and the systematic meetings between the USSR foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state, which did not exist during the first years of the present Washington administration, have made it possible to embark on the joint examination of many problems of vital importance not only to our countries' peoples but also to all mankind.

Of course, this dialogue has its difficulties and even its aggravations. But the important point is that it is in train, in motion, and has led to a mutual awareness of the need to transfer Soviet-U.S. relations to the dimension of the practical, specific, and major results that people all over the world expect from the USSR and the United States.

The situation with regard to the preparation of the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles was discussed in detail during the conversation. In the process the Soviet side emphasized the particular importance of the further work [prorabotka] that still remains to be done on problems of strict verification of compliance with the agreement's provisions. These problems, which are important in relation to the agreement in question, are also of great importance for the prospect of the next, upcoming step—the 50% reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

This step occupied a central place in the conversation in the Kremlin. Both sides regard it as crucial to ending the nuclear arms race and to Soviet-U.S. relations. Since the question of reducing strategic arms is closely linked to the problem of the nonplacement of weapons in space, M.S. Gorbachev put forward additional specific proposals aimed at finding solutions that satisfy both sides.

The new Soviet compromise proposals, which go some of the way toward meeting [idushchiye navstrechu] the U.S. side's wishes, will be analyzed in detail in the press later, of course. For the moment I will merely note that they open the way toward wasting no time in stepping up work to agree on positions in the spheres of strategic offensive armaments and space both at the Geneva talks and at other levels.

Progress along this path would make it possible at the projected new Soviet-U.S. summit this year, in additon to signing the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, to enshrine accords on the key points of future agreements on strategic offensive armaments and space so that in turn they could be signed during R. Reagan's return visit to the Soviet Union. Such a program would impart breadth of scale to the agenda of the summit in Washington.

The Soviet side expressed the confidence that 6 weeks are enough to properly study and prepare all these questions so that the Washington meeting can be held at the projected time. However, we also remain cautious about the possible results.

G. Shultz, who held a press conference in Moscow, remarked in this connection that M.S. Gorbachev "is still not sufficiently satisfied with the position in the sphere of space and defense for this position to permit him to visit Washington." But in my view, it is clear that matters hinge on the necessary realism and flexibility of the U.S. side.

Our country's vital interest in resolving the problems of disarmament was confirmed by this week's USSR Supreme Soviet session, which was entirely devoted to questions concerning the Soviet people's peaceful creative labor at the present crucial stage in our restructuring.

"Black Monday" on Wall Street, which revealed the flaw in the present state of the U.S. economy, reminded people in a new and alarming way that the United States has an equal interest in stopping and reversing the arms race.

The broadest sections of the international public are demanding with growing persistence that the process of disarmament and above all nuclear disarmament should at last begin to be implemented through concrete actions. They have shown this in worldwide mass demonstrations as part of the World Peace Wave. These demands will be reaffirmed during Disarmament Action Week, which began yesterday. Tension in the Persian Gulf [subhead]

There are two other international events which have attracted great attention this week. The first was the military action taken by the United States in the Persian Gulf. The second was the panic that broke out on the New York Stock Exchange and did not spare the exchanges of other leading capitalist countries. Some Western commentators have linked these events, being of the opinion that what happened in the Persian Gulf could have been a factor behind the panic on Wall Street. Although the coincidence of these events was nevertheless clearly fortuitous, there does indeed exist a certain link between them which is determined by the interdependence of U.S. domestic and foreign policy.

On Monday 19 October four U.S. warships shelled two Iranian oil platforms in the international waters of the Persian Gulf, after which a special U.S. Navy sabotage squad placed explosives on them in order to put them completely out of action.

The United States is trying to justify this military operation, whose target, contrary to all the norms of international law, was civilian installations belonging to a sovereign state, by claiming that it was a response to the Iranian shelling of Kuwaiti oil tankers sailing under the U.S. flag. But, as was to be expected, these strong-arm tactics have merely exacerbated tension. A missile strike against a Kuwaiti platform soon followed.

Thus what we have is an expansion of military action. Here we are talking not just about armed conflict directly involving yet another of the region's states—Kuwait. In point of fact the United States is also becoming a participant in it.

Such a development of events could have been foreseen as soon as Washington began to build up its naval forces in the Persian Gulf. The Soviet Union repeatedly warned about the dangers of this move. From the beginning our country has pointed out that such actions by the United States will not only not help ensure freedom of navigation in the Gulf but will lead to even greater exacerbation of the already heated situation there. The continuation of such a course could spell the end to much that has been achieved in the process that has begun of easing international tension, including in Soviet-U.S. relations.

The Western states allied to the the United States which, having followed its, to put it bluntly, bad example, have sent their warships there, should also, in my view, draw the relevant conclusions from what has happened in the Persian Gulf this past week. Their presence in the Gulf also increases the danger of the conflict spreading and threatens to involve the relevant countries in military actions.

Calling on Iran and Iraq to end the bloody war that has already cost the lives of more than 1 million people and criticizing actions leading to even greater exacerbation of the situation, no matter whose actions are responsible, the USSR is putting forward a specific and constructive proposal envisaging the withdrawal of all foreign navies of nonlittoral states from the waters of the Persian Gulf and the introduction of UN naval forces there. The elaboration of practical measures to implement this proposal could be be put in the hands of the UN Security Council Military Staff Committee.

As for removing the prime cause of the present dangerous situation in the Persian Gulf—the Iran-Iraq war—the path to achieving this goal is already mapped out in UN Security Council Resolution 598. It is essential now that all states, and above all those which voted for the resolution (and they include the United States), do everything possible to promote the success of the UN secretary general's mission to implement its provisions and do not obstruct it by unilateral, dangerous action.
Chaos on the Exchanges [subhead]

The headlong fall in the price of shares that also occurred last Monday appeared even more ominous, since the size of the fall greatly exceeded that of the stock exchange crash of 1929, which started the "Great Depression" of the thirties. I would remind people that shares then depreciated by 12.9% in one day, whereas this time it was 22%.

No less ominous a symptom was the fact that the panic which gripped Wall Street, when shareholders, including very large companies, were seeking to divest themselves of shares as quickly as possible and at virtually any price, instantly spread to the exchanges of other capitalist countries

True, the situation had already righted itself somewhat on Tuesday. The Dow Jones Index, the most reliable indicator of the state of the shares market, which had fallen 580 points the previous day, had recovered 102 points by the end of Tuesday. However, in the days that followed the exchanges continued to shake feverishly.

The panic was all the stronger in that, at first glance, the upheaval experienced by the stock exchange seemed to many shareholders not only unexpected but unjustified. This state of bewilderment was expressed by, among others, the New York correspondent of France's TF-I television channel, who stated that the "drop in value had no rational basis." The economic correspondent of *The New York Times*, responding quickly to the events, wrote in the same vein but in somewhat greater detail. According to him, "analysts are ransacking their brains to find explanations, explanations which vary from the growth in interest rates to the decline in the value of the dollar and the possibility of war between the United States and Iran. Many experts," he went on, "apparently consider that, so far as one can judge, the undermining of agreements on maintaining commercial and currency stability between the United States and its leading trade partners was a major catalyst." The chief economist of Britain's Lloyds Merchant Bank was more definite. "I think," he said, "that a lack of sufficient confidence in

American (economic) policy and anxiety about increasing interest rates in the United States lie at the heart of the problem." A similar thought was expressed quite categorically by the moderator of France's Channel 3 television program. In his view, what happened on the exchanges "indicates a loss of confidence in the American economy."

It only required the first state of shock to be experienced for observers to recall that not only economists, including Americans, but also competent political figures had long warned that, despite all the apparent prosperity (a certain increase in the level of employment in recent years and a reduction in the rate of inflation), the economic position of the world's biggest capitalist country was bound to cause alarm because it was spending more than it earned and living in debt.

In reality no matter how draconian a cut in state appropriations for social needs is made by the Washington administration, it does not, of course, cover even a tiny fraction of the vast resources spent on unproductive expenditure in the military sphere. True, they are met to a somewhat larger extent by foreign investors of capital in U.S. banks, who are attracted by high interest rates. But this does not eliminate the state debt, which has already reached an astronomical figure and is now rapidly approaching the $3 trillion mark, which is turning the United States into the world' biggest debtor. At the same time the artificial reduction in the rate of the dollar, designed together with direct protectionist measures to promote an increase in exports of U.S. goods and reduce imports of foreign ones, badly hits the interests of America's trading partners and aggravates contradictions between them but fails to achieve the goal of reducing the foreign trade deficit.

In these conditions the latent lack of confidence in the U.S. economy that had built up only awaited an occasion to break out into the open.

It required some days to pass after "Black Monday" before economists and politicians were able to assess more soberly a situation which was initially difficult to explain.

The crash on the exchange, the *New York Daily News* writes, has led to an "undermining of faith in the U.S. economy and the administration's ability to direct the country's destiny." *The New York Times* observes that "Irrespective of how things stand on the exchange, Americans will be unable to forget Monday 19 October, when the situation began to go out of control and there was no confidence at all that the President would be able to cope with what was happening."

It is instructive that most financial experts agree that a new fall in the value of shares can be expected despite a certain restoration of calm on the exchange.

It is natural that the upheaval on the New York exchange, the chaos, to use President Reagan's term, should cause numerous commentaries outside America too, particularly as the panic did not spare other countries. France's *Le Monde*, for example, wrote that "the U.S. economy now resembles a truck which is heading straight for a wall at full speed while its driver seems to have no intention of braking."

However, the chaos on the exchanges has confirmed the very unhappy state of the whole economy of the capitalist world.

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable'
LD252112 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 25 Oct 87

["International Observers Roundtable" program, presented by commentator Viktor Nikolayevich Levin, with Vitaliy Vladimirovich Zhurkin, deputy director of the United States and Canada Institute, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; and Political Observer Nikolay Vladimirovich Shishlin]

[Text] [Levin] Hello, esteemed comrades! This week the Moscow talks which took place between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and USSR Foreign Minister Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze, and U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, were at the center of attention of the international public. The foreign ministers, the leaders of the foreign affairs departments of the two countries, talked a great deal and in great detail, and the conversation between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Shultz was also very detailed—it lasted some 5 hours. You already know the results of these talks, in the main, from the documents that have been published; therefore, today we would like to turn your attention to the main points and explanations of some of the issues.

[Shishlin] Viktor Nikolayevich, you know that the following question has been raised among the first reactions to the Moscow talks which you have just mentioned: Is Shultz' visit to Moscow a failure, or does this visit represent a success? As you know, people like these very clear definitions and these very straightforward evaluations. But it seems to me, in fact, that the meeting here in Moscow between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Shultz, and the talks conducted by our foreign minister with the U.S. secretary of state do not lend themselves to such a simple definition. I return mentally to those days when the Reykjavik meeting took place. At the time many also evaluated the Reykjavik meeting as being a failure and a flop. But in effect it was a breakthrough to absolutely new horizons in international relations, as well as Soviet-U.S. relations. Although on the surface it would seem that Shultz has departed without a date for a summit meeting, that Shultz has departed from Moscow without a clear solution to strengthening the ABM Treaty, without a solution to the issue of strategic offensive arms, nevertheless, in essence,

all the same, the assets of Soviet-U.S. relations have been substantially increased as a result of these 2 days in Moscow. This is, in principle, a new pinnacle which has been scaled; very substantial and fundamental work has been done, and one shouldn't be embarrassed by the fact that in the course of this meeting there were very serious difficulties which still haven't been overcome, because Soviet-U.S. relations, and we musn't forget this, are burdened by a great many problems, often created purely as a result of Washington's actions and its adherence to some ideas which, to tell you frankly, seem to me to be fantastic.

[Levin] Well, of course, when we talk about the results of this meeting and talk about what it failed to do, one must also have in mind what it did do.

[Zhurkin] Yes, of course: in other words, if we are all agreed that the meeting is a definite stage in making headway toward serious accords on limiting and reducing arms, if we are agreed on this, then one needs to have a look at what was achieved in Moscow. I would just like to make a reservation. I think that in holding any talks, there are always some first steps which come fairly easily, because they are already imminent, and often they're even overdue, and the nearer one gets to the end of the talks, instinctively, somehow, the complex issues are usually carried over to the end of the talks, and so, at the end, matters always proceed with greater difficulty. It is namely from this point of view, I think, that one should look at the talks about a treaty on medium and shorter-range missiles. In Moscow a whole range of issues was resolved which evidently, simply couldn't have been resolved in Geneva; in Moscow they were resolved. Significantly fewer unresolved issues remain; so few that there is already talk about specific dates to finish them off, because the issues that remain are not major or fundamental. This is, of course, an achievement, an achievement for the Moscow meeting.

[Levin] The official report on Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's reception of George Shultz says that a treaty on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles could be prepared in the course of a month and a half, and could be ready for signing. At his press conference Eduard Amvrosiyevich Shevardnadze expressed an even more optimistic point of view: In his opinion, it could be fitted into 3 weeks.

But this is a detail, this is a detail. The very fact that a treaty on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles—and we all view this treaty as being a first, very important step, of fundamental importance, on the path of limiting and reducing, and subsequently eliminating nuclear arms.

In general, this treaty is ready, it is virtually ready, and undoubtedly, this is a very important point, it is a fundamentally important point. In connection with this, I would like to draw the attention of our listeners to the following fact, the following detail: Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev has proposed declaring a moratorium from 1 November on all work connected with the production, testing, and deployment of medium-range and shorter-range missiles. The question may arise: As a treaty is virtually ready, as the sides—both the Soviet Union and the United States—proceed from the fact that it could be signed before the end of this year, why this moratorium from 1 November? If we turn to the real facts, we will see that this moratorium is necessary, it is essential. You understand, the Americans can say: We are acting in accordance with a program worked out in advance, but a fact remains a fact. On the eve of Shultz' arrival in Moscow, equipment arrived at a U.S. military base in the Netherlands, in [name indistinct] for the deployment of cruise missiles there. Yes, this plan was worked out a long time ago, but today, when the issue of the elaboration of a treaty on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles has not just become imminent, but, one can say, has become overdue, the implementation of these plans causes perplexity at the very least.

[Shishlin] An agreement on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles, in any case, will also require ratification, and this is a distance in time which may turn out to be either short or long, and of course, on a practical level, a moratorium would be a very useful and practical step which, in this direction as well, would create the indispensable atmosphere. At the same time, such a moratorium, of course, would influence the state of Soviet-U.S. affairs as a whole; it would strengthen mutual understanding and strengthen trust, i.e. what we, at the moment, as before, lack very much in Soviet-U.S. relations.

[Zhurkin] Of course. Nikolay Vladimirovich, I think that while assessing the situation from this businesslike, calm, optimistic point of view, we, of course, must not shut our eyes to the negative aspects of this Soviet-U.S. interface. We still failed to come to an understanding on a whole range of issues; this is a fact, and once again, incidentally, as was the case in Reykjavik, once again everything at the moment, as before, breaks down against the United States' unwillingness to strictly adhere in the future to the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, against the U.S. urge to bypass this treaty, and against this SDI program which is well-known to us all. In this sense, I personally find those groans and cries that reach us from Washington strange, as well as this sort of simply panicking assessment—though I exaggerate somewhat—of the outcome of Shultz' visit, and everything is concentrated on one thing: No agreement was arrived at about the dates for holding a summit meeting. The real issues of major interactions between the two countries—the treaty concerning medium and shorter-range missiles, the 50% reduction in strategic offensive arms, the observance of the treaty on limiting antimissile defense systems, and others—these issues are being bypassed. One gets the impression that Shultz seemingly travelled to Moscow with only one aim: to obtain the date for a summit meeting and to rest content with that. But a meeting is

not held for the sake of a meeting. The meeting must record the new positive shifts in the process of limiting and reducing arms; naturally, such a meeting would do no harm to the Reagan administration, for political reasons, but neither the world nor the Soviet Union can be guided by any U.S. Administration's particular domestic politics interests. One must look at things more broadly, on a larger scale, and in this sense, it seems to me, this initial reaction from Washington is simply somewhat annoying, I would say.

[Shishlin] a certain fossilization of U.S. foreign political positions, however, can be discerned in the Moscow talks and in the reaction to the talks. This fossilization is particularly visible in what concerns the SDI, the Strategic Defense Initiative, or the Star Wars program. This is Washington's favorite icon which the President, the secretary of state or the secretary of defense worship in nearly all their speeches on foreign policy.

[Levin] The secretary of defense in particular.

[Shishlin] Yes, but what is the real situation? The Soviet Union—and this was said precisely at the meeting between Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev and George Shultz—sees the problem of deep reductions of strategic offensive arms followed by their liquidation as a truly key problem. This is, in essence, a pivotal issue because, let us be frank, in what concerns medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles, even given all the deterrent nature of these arms, one has to understand that they account for only a small part of the nuclear arsenals.

[Zhurkin] About 3 to 4%.

[Shishlin] Yes, a small part of the nuclear arsenals of the Soviet Union and United States, whereas strategic offensive arms are a very serious thing. Getting down to basics, the Soviet Union, as is known, proposed to divide everything in half in Reykjavik whereas this time it went even further and, in fact, it agreed to establishing such sublimits for strategic offensive arms which would, indeed, create a firm parity between our country and the United States. Yet there is a strategic linkage there. If we agree to make deep cuts in strategic offensive arms, then there should be no question of any kind of arms in space. But it is precisely on the SDI, the Star Wars program, that the United States is pinning all its hopes for attaining superiority over the Soviet Union there, in that area. Of course, this is a very strong hindrance to Soviet-U.S. relations. This is a hindrance that nearly always blocks progress, indeed.

[Levin] One should mention that our position is distinguished by great flexibility; one has, perhaps, to pay attention to this point too. Yes, we oppose the SDI in principle, we oppose in principle the siting of weapons in space, as we understand perfectly well what it means—it is a new spiral of the arms race, and in that case it would be simply ludicrous to speak about any control [kontrol]. But we are prepared to go our part of the way in what concerns the development of science and research. After Reykjavik proposals were made according to which it is possible to permit research work and the creation of the corresponding mock-ups and samples in laboratory conditions, on testing grounds or in production conditions. We went as far as to propose that a list of devices banned from being placed in space should be defined and that the limits, maximum parameters, and specifications for those devices should be set, whole everything that is within those limits—certainly, you may develop [razvivayte] them. Science cannot come to a standstill, we understand that, but science should not cause harm to mankind. At the meeting with Shultz Mikhail Sergeyevich made very profound proposals. What are we talking about? We are proposing that the United States should agree to legally fix the commitment to abstain for 10 years from using the right to abandon the ABM Treaty and to observe it strictly. Naturally, we will make the same commitment too. The Soviet Union agrees to establish the limits for the number of warheads on individual kinds of Soviet and U.S. stratigic offensive weapons. We are prepared to accept that not more than 3,300 warheads should be installed on intercontinental ballistic missiles, not more than 1,800-2,000 warheads should be installed on ballistic missiles on submarines, and not more than 800-900 warheads on cruise missiles borne on aircraft within a total limit of 6,000 warheads for these kinds of arms.

[Zhurkin] On the whole, this is close to the figures that were more than once mentioned in the course of the Geneva talks by both sides.

[Levin] We are laying down only one single condition: Let us confirm the validity of the ABM Treaty for a further 10 years as a minimum. When the United States says: No, we are ready to talk with you but we want to discard the ABM Treaty, then, indeed, an extremely delicate situation arises here. Just look at what Shultz said at the press conference. He repeated it several times: The main question is how we can defend ourselves against ballistic missiles. We are proposing to reduce those missiles, we are proposing to act so that nuclear arms in general should be liquidated by the year 2000, but the United State either does not hear this or does not want to hear this and shapes its own course stubbornly. Flexibility, but we are flatly against taking nuclear arms into space. The sooner the Washington administration understands this, the better will it be, perhaps, for the course and development of Soviet-U.S. relations in general and for the course of the talks on limiting stratigic offensive arms, in particular.

[Zhurkin] You know, Viktor Nikolayevich, the stubbornness of Reagan's administration on the issue of the militarization of space is, on the whole, so offensive, as if someone were deliberately directing us toward the idea—though it is not so—just wait a little, Reagan's administration has 15 months more to work, and when it goes, maybe the SDI program will be abolished or altered

[sentence as heard]. Incidentally, this is also a serious question. The Soviet Union does not hold views like that. Our side is inclined to keep pace and to make progress in resolving the problem of limiting and reducing arms, whereas the U.S. side behaves in such a way that this pace could start slowing down and nothing good will come of it for either side, as a result.

[Shishlin] Vitaliy Vladimorovich, though I think that in what concerns both the SDI and strategic offensive arms, I think that this deep discussion itself, though it has not brought about any palpable results, has been productive in a sense.

[Zhurkin] You mean the aspect of strategic offensive arms, do you not?

[Shishlin] Yes I do, and I think that it has been productive in the aspect of the SDI too. In what respect? In so far as I think that the U.S. side at the moment has a better idea of the fact that the Soviet Union is not afraid of the SDI. I can see that I use here a fairly domestic verb—afraid or not afraid—but, indeed, it is not afraid of the SDI. Finally, for us, if such is the lot or the fate of our generation, the Soviet Union will find its response to the SDI and a response which will be more economical and sufficiently effective, as a response to the SDI. Yet we cannot neglect the redoubtable realities in which we live. In essence, in our philosophy of peace, in our philosophy of international relations we proceed from the fact that it is necessary to assert the new thinking. Enough of competing in the arms race, be it on earth or in space! You said it quite reasonably, Viktor Nikolayevich, what sort of defense against ballistic missiles should be in question if we regard the liquidation of those ballistic missiles as being of paramount importance? This is the most effective defense against ballistic missiles—to bring them to nought. This is the Soviet position. Naturally, it is at the very least senseless to create [sozdavat] now means of defense against ballistic missiles—let us agree for a moment that it is a defense against ballistic missiles—if a course is being taken toward liquidating this class of weapons too. I think that there is now very rich food for thought. It is possible to conclude an agreement of medium and shorter-range missiles, it is possible to make deep cuts in strategic offensive weapons, it is possible to strengthen the provisions of the ABM Treaty, and the visit by the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee to Washington is possible, too. All this is within one's reach. The way we are going to live through November and December 1987 and what not only 1988, but the following years too, are going to bring in Soviet-U.S. and international relations will depend on what not only Washington's thoughts and reflections will be, but also what Washington's thought-out response to the results the U.S. secretary of state's conversations in Moscow will be.

[Levin] Nikolay Vladimirovich, you just said that it depends on how Washington is now going to act in light of those new phenomena which opened up in the course of the Soviet-U.S. negotiations in Moscow. It occured to me that, starting yesterday, this is the week of action for disarmament. The Soviet Union is acting in that mode, while the involvement of the United States so far has been fairly feeble. Although, let us reiterate this, an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles has been practically reached and an accord has been reached for wide-scale negotiations on nuclear testing to start on 9 December, this too is a very important feature. There is forward movement. But at the same time this very issue of Star Wars remains.

When you, Vitaliy Vladimirovich, were saying that some political figures in the United States say: All right, the present administration will depart and the road will be cleared, and the question of Star Wars may be viewed by the successors in a manner very remote from the present one; I remembered that during this frenzied outbreak—this week there was a truly frenzied outbreak of stock exchange fever—in some U.S. papers you could glimpse the idea that one of the key causes of that fever consisted in the inordinate U.S. budget and trade balance deficits. It is precisely this which once again says that the mindless expenditure on Star Wars is damaging the interests of the United States and Reagan's successor is hardly likely to agree to the appropriation of that money. But that is a hypothetical question, while the question of the stock exchange fever is indeed directly related to the actions of the U.S. administration in the foreign political arena.

[Zhurkin] Of course, Viktor Nikolayevich, and also to the fate of the Reagan administration. The administration's term of office is nearing its end. Presumably every administration should in a way ponder upon what it brought with it. My impression is that the result, the way it looks now, today, is depressing. In that sense the stock exchange fever is, of course, appraised in different ways around the world. There are completely panic-oriented appraisals, comparing this fever with the fever at the stock exchange in October 1929. There are completely composed appraisals that some sort of correction is taking place; and it is obvious where these appraisals come from—first and foremost from President Reagan himself. There are the appraisals by serious economists. It has indeed been an unusual event and it is not going to recede into the past and dissolve somewhere in the mist of history just like that. The New York Stock Exchange has indeed experienced a major shock. I shall cite just two figures. On "Black Monday," at the beginning of this week, the fall in the value of shares came to 22%. Then there were oscillating leaps, some increases and over the week 9 of these lost 22% were recovered. Nevertheless, the week's sum total was a 13% drop in the value of shares. That's a colossal figure, that's hundreds of billions of dollars. What is this stock exchange panic going to lead do? Will it lead to the beginning of a crisis? The majority of economists agree that that is hardly likely. Will it pass without a trace? Nobody answers that in the affirmative. All in all, this time the stock exchange has shown that the United States has a powerful but

unhealthy economy and the main task at the moment is to diagnose how unhealthy it is. The Reagan administration will probably face the problem of what to do next. My personal feeling is that the Reagan administration somehow wants to drag along its economy in an uncollapsed state to the elections and to the time of its departure in January 1989, and then to dump it on the shoulders of the next administration, which is going to face the necessity of taking very decisive actions in the field of economics. If we remove the sensationalist coating from the stock exchange panic in the United States, as well as in other major Western capitals, it is clear that that this is merely the tip of an iceberg and that processes which are very complex and unpleasant for the United States have begun.

[Levin] It has so happened in today's program that we have been paying most attention to Soviet-U.S. relations. This is natural but at the same time we cannot ignore another event, which started several hours ago. I am thinking of the 13th CPC Congress. It is a major country, the largest one in terms of population. The Communist Party is enormous—it has 46 million party members. Very important issues have been placed before the congress: a report paper from the Central Committee, one of the key chapters of whch is a chapter named General Political Structure Reform Conceptions, draft amendments to a number of items in the CPC rules are being examined, a report paper from the Central Advisory Commission, and a report paper from the CPC Central Discipline Inspection Commission will be discussed. New leading bodies are to be elected. It is being said that a substantial rejuvenation of the leading bodies will take place. Already now it is being noted that of the 1,936 delegates to the congress 58.8% are people under the age of 55. Deng Xiaoping has called this congress a congress of reforms, while the *Renmin Ribao* daily described it at somewhat greater length. It wrote, also naturally in the circumstances, that the congress will lay down the party's principal political line for the realization of the reforms and determine the speed and magnitude of comprehensive transformations in the PRC. It is a very important congress and, of course, it is evoking great interest throughout the world.

[Shishlin] The Chinese comrades have been working in a very interesting way over the last few years and, of course, within the line of the four modernizations course they have achieved quite important results, above all in the economy, but not only in the economy. I think that in itself China's experience, which now is the very subject of the Chinese communists' deliberations, this Chinese experience is not without interest to its neighbors, including a neighbor of China such as our country. This does not mean that the Soviet Union should borrow Chinese experience and transplant it mechanically onto its own ground, but it is extremely useful for us to know this Chinese experience in the period of restructuring. But I think that all in all Chinese affairs remain Chinese affairs and we have every liking for our great neighbor and wish the Chinese communists and Chinese working people every success in the solution of those problems—not easy problems—that they are dealing with.

But I think that the thing which concerns us first and foremost is the state of Soviet-Chinese relations. I think that although Soviet-Chinese relations have come out of a state of stagnation, they are filling out with visible content in respect of economic, scientific and technical, and cultural cooperation. All in all, if I were to mark the state of political relations between the Soviet Union and China on a five-point scale it would get at best three plus, and even then I am not sure...

[Levin—interrupting] The plus is debatable.

[Shishlin] That's right, if the plus should be there. Here, I think, we of course, could wish the 13th CPC Congress that the revolutionary spirit which propels them in domestic affairs, may that very revolutionary spirit also illuminate Chinese foreign policy, so that the Chinese comrades may look without prejudice also at the prospects for development of political relations between our country and People's China. I think that good, friendly cooperation between the Soviet Union and China in all areas, in every direction, is not far off, but this cooperation has to be worked toward, worked toward from two sides, equally from our side and from China's side.

[Levin] Let us hope that this work will prove fruitful. Our program is over. Thank you, esteemed comrades, for your attention. All the best to you.

United States & Canada

More on Shevardnadze News Conference on Talks

PM261143 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 Second Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Step Toward Important Agreements. E.A. Shevardnadze's News Conference"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR foreign minister, held a news conference 23 October at the Press Center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

The Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow, he said, have been completed. Taking part in them on the U.S. side were Secretary of State G. Shultz, the President's national security adviser, F. Carlucci, and a large group of specialists and experts and administration representatives. Without doubt, the central event of the talks was the lengthy meeting (some 5 hours in all) between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of our party's Central Committee, and the U.S. secretary of state. It took place in an atmosphere of amicability, the most complex issues of the day were discussed in depth and in a businesslike manner, and a definite result was obtained.

In recent times much has been changing in Soviet-U.S. relations, and changing for the better. In this context I would like to talk briefly about what preceded the present Moscow meeting.

The summit meetings—in Geneva and, especially, in Reykjavik—were of very great importance for Soviet-U.S. relations—and not only for these relations. Many of you are familiar with M.S. Gorbachev's words on the Reykjavik meeting as an intellectual breakthrough in the most important areas of the present time—the problems of eliminating the nuclear arsenals. It was precisely the Reykjavik accords and the mutual understanding reached in the Icelandic capital which have formed the basis of all subsequent talks at various levels and predetermined the intensive process of formulating agreements on the elimination of nuclear armaments.

The U.S. secretary of state came to Moscow in April of this year; he held talks with the general secretary of the party's Central Committee, the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and other Soviet leaders.

It was the April meeting that laid the foundations for the achievement of an accord on the two classes of nuclear weapons. It was the April meeting that spoke of a sharp reduction in strategic offensive armaments and the strengthening of the antimissile defense treaty as the central issue of the Soviet-U.S. talks on the range of disarmament problems. Following this were the September talks in Washington. In our conversations with the U.S. President and the secretary of state we agreed in principle on the elimination of Soviet and U.S. medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles, and we achieved mutual understanding on the complex—delicate, I would say—problem of the Pershing-1A missiles which belong to the FRG, while the charges for them belong to the United States.

The world community greeted the news of this with enthusiasm, rightly discerning in the Soviet-U.S. accord a launchpad for real and more wide-scale nuclear disarmament.

At that same time in Washington we agreed on the present meeting in Moscow. Its aim—the preparation of a draft agreement on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles and a specific [predmetnyy] discussion of the problem of reducing strategic offensive armaments. In the system of Soviet-U.S. relations this problem is central, and this is exactly how M.S. Gorbachev describes it.

Now the Moscow meeting itself. As a whole it has been useful and productive [rezultativnyy]. I believe that in this respect our opinion ought not to diverge from the opinion of the secretary of state.

First, we succeeded in surmounting certain very serious obstacles which had arisen in Geneva at the Soviet-U.S. talks on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles. A provision governing the Pershing-1A has finally been formulated, and this is of enormous importance because, I repeat, this is really a very subtle, very delicate problem in the resolution of which our allies—the GDR and Czechoslovakia—and, of course, the leadership of the FRG—have played a positive role.

Second, here in Moscow we have agreed on schedules for the elimination of medium- and shorter-range missiles and on the procedures governing their destruction and the exchange of data on these classes of missile, and we have moved far ahead on questions of verification and inspection.

True, because of a lack of time we failed in Moscow to discuss completely everything relating to verification, but it is possible to state in principle: All the basic problems connected with the elimination of the two classes of missile and, correspondingly, the conclusion of an agreement, have been resolved. This is one aspect of the matter, an important and fundamental one. If it hadn't been for the Moscow meeting—no offense intended to our experts and negotiators working in Geneva—the matter would have dragged on for a long time. The Moscow talks have accelerated it and facilitated the conclusion of this important process.

Finally, we have to our credit useful talks on the start, on determining a date for the start of wide-ranging talks on nuclear tests. We have finally got a fix on this, and this can only be cause for rejoicing because the problem of nuclear tests is one that particularly worries the world community.

In line with the Washington accord, the Moscow talks centered on the problem of a 50% cut in strategic offensive armaments and the maintenance and strengthening of the ABM Treaty.

In his conversation with the secretary of state M.S. Gorbachev submitted new and fundamentally important proposals on determining the quantitative levels of the concentration of charges on the individual forms of the strategic triad: intercontinental ballistic missiles, submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and air-launched cruise missiles carried on strategic bombers. Permit me to inform you of these figures. Comrade M.S. Gorbachev proposed setting the upper ceiling for intercontinental ballistic missiles at 3,000-3,300 warheads, at 1,800-2,000 [warheads] for submarine-launched ballistic missiles, and at 800-900 units for air-launched cruise missiles.

Whoever looks into this problem, whoever follows the Soviet-U.S. talks will concede that these figures are very close to those positions which have repeatedly been set out by the U.S. Administration. I believe that we have taken a very large step along the road of achieving an agreement on a sharp reduction in strategic offensive armaments.

But you are also aware of our position regarding the ABM Treaty: It must be maintained in the form in which it was signed and ratified, and, as a minimum, it must be adhered to for a period of 10 years. We spoke of this at Reykjavik; we have spoken of this at all subsequent meetings. It will not be an exaggeration to say that the absolute majority of states, U.S. allies included, share this opinion: The ABM Treaty must be maintained.

This position has not been a rigid one. Following Reykjavik we endeavored to make certain amplifications [utochneniya] for its development, and in much we went to meet the Americans. We said—and we are now confirming—that we allow research [issledovatelskiye] and not only research work, that we will accept the creation of the corresponding dummy models in laboratory conditions, on test ranges, in production, and so forth [sozdaniye sootvetstvuyushchikh maketov obraztsov v laboratornykh usloviyakh, na poligonakh, na proizvodstve i t. d.].

But even this is not all. At the talks in Washington we proposed to the U.S. Administration that we define a list of devices whose placement in space is prohibited. We conveyed to it accordingly the parameters and characteristics of these devices. In other words, we determined that: All instruments and devices created below these parameters are not prohibited. I want to emphasize: This premise is of fundamental importance for the achievement of an agreement on observing the ABM Treaty for the duration of the stipulated term.

Unfortunately, in Moscow the U.S. delegation did not display readiness to discuss on a businesslike and constructive basis questions of the maintenance of the ABM Treaty. We failed to have this discussion—a key factor within the system of preparing for a meeting between CPSU Central Committee General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev and President Reagan, which, as we agreed in Washington, was to have been held this fall. There too we talked in principle about an approximate program of further summit-level contacts: to sign the agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, which would be prepared beforehand in Moscow with a view to allowing the leaders of our two states to concentrate their main attention on the problem of strategic offensive armaments and the ABM Treaty.

The next stage of the Soviet-U.S. summit-level contacts was to be a visit by the U.S. President to the Soviet Union in the first half of next year, during which an agreement on strategic offensive armaments in conditions of the observance and maintenance of the ABM Treaty would be signed.

This is how the entire program of future contacts looked to us. The U.S. side displayed interest in it. We discussed it in principle, having in view that such a scenario provides the real possibility of the ratification of both the first and second treaties. Why am telling you about all these nuances in such detail? In order to emphasize that we are ready to strive for a major breakthrough in the reduction of nuclear arsenals with this present administration.

Unfortunately, the Moscow talks failed to make any headway precisely in this decisive area.

I deem it extremely important to inform you that the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee has reaffirmed his readiness to meet with President Reagan in order to sign a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles, but chiefly in order to define the key provisions of an agreement on strategic offensive armaments and the maintenance of the ABM Treaty. He also told the secretary of state that our new proposals on strategic offensive armaments will possibly require some time for their specific, in-depth examination by the U.S. Administration, and that we are prepared to wait.

Moreover, the general secretary proposed that, without waiting for the signing of an agreement on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, a bilateral moratorium be proclaimed on the production, deployment, and testing of these types of weapons. He also informed the secretary of state of our readiness to halt and freeze [zakonservirovat] the construction of the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station for a 12-month period, voicing the hope that the U.S. Administration would respond to this proposal in the corresponding manner by pursuing an analagous course of action in respect of the radar station under construction in Scotland. As always, the talks in

Moscow discussed questions of banning and eliminating chemical weapons and concluding a corresponding convention, questions of conventional armaments, and regional problems.

I would single out here the situation now obtaining in the Persian Gulf, the Iran-Iraq war, the situation in Central America, the situation surrounding a political settlement of the Cambodian problem, the situation on the Korean peninsula, and certain other issues. As always, there was discussion of questions concerned with human rights, or—as we say in the general, broader plane—humanitarian problems.

Despite the fact that there wasn't any serious progress on the central problem, we consider the Moscow talks to have been useful and productive.

We do not rule out contacts at various levels in the future. Naturally, the talks in Geneva will be intensified—both delegations have received such an instruction.

In a word, we look to the future with a certain optimism.

E.A. Shevardnadze then replied to questions put by Soviet and foreign correspondents.

Question: As I understood you, is just a treaty on medium-range missiles insufficient for General Secretary M.S. Gorbachev to meet with R. Reagan?

Answer: This treaty is practically ready. Progress in the central salient is now essential. It is possible, and we will strive for such progress.

Question: Mr Shevardnadze, for many years Soviet diplomacy was headed by Mr Gromyko. Now you are continuing to implement the peaceful foreign strategy of the Soviet Union. In this connection I would like to ask you: Tell us, please, what was said during the talks regarding the Iran-Iraq war? We are interested not in the general information but in the precise details of the discussion of this very complex situation.

Answer: The situation surrounding the Iran-Iraq war and the position in the Persian Gulf was discussed in detail in Washington, in New York, and in Moscow.

How do matters stand here?

Today M.S. Gorbachev once again set out the Soviet position on this score. It consists in assisting the implementation of Security Council Resolution 598 and facilitating the success of the UN secretary general's mission. The plan of his actions was examined and approved in September by the Security Council acting at the level of the permanent members' foreign ministers. This plan gives the UN secretary general a good chance of seeking a peaceful political settlement of the conflict. This is one aspect of the matter. Another aspect is the USSR's relations with Iran and with Iraq. We maintain constant contacts with the leaderships of these countries, in respect of which we are pursuing an open [otkrytyy] and honest policy.

Finally, another aspect of no little importance—and the U.S. secretary of state was also informed of this unequivocally today, as earlier in Washington and New York—which is the absolutely impermissible scale of the concentration of armed forces, ships, aircraft, and other means in the Persian Gulf, and primarily the Armed Forces of the United States of America. We believe that such a concentration can undoubtedly provoke, and is already provoking, consequences which can run out of control.

What do we propose? If we are talking about creating the essential conditions for freedom of navigation in the Persian Gulf—putting into action the mechanism of the Security Council, the mechanism provided for by the UN Charter. If the presence of armed forces and armaments in this gulf is really necessary, then this can be done under the flag of the United Nations. For this there exists within the UN system a special institution—the Security Council's Military Staff Committee. At the Security Council session in New York in September we said that the USSR Armed Forces' chief of General Staff is prepared to fly to New York at any moment and take part in the work of such a committee to define the essential measures promoting the ensurance of free navigation in the Persian Gulf. Such is our position—honest and unbiased.

Question: I have two questions. First: How possible is the convening of the international conference on establishing peace in the Near East which the Soviet Union has proposed? Has there been any rapprochement of Moscow's and Washington's viewpoints on this problem during the conversations with Shultz?

Second: Does the outcome of the meeting with Shultz mean that there will be no Soviet-U.S. summit this year?

Answer: Despite all the acuteness and urgency of the Near East problems, on this occasion we simply were unable to discuss them thoroughly. Again there wasn't enough time. But we talked about it in Washington and in New York. In a couple of words: When the idea of an international conference on a Near East settlement was mooted, not all states were in agreement with it. Now, the absolute majority of Near East countries and the permanent members of the Security Council, including the United States, share this idea. Who understands the tasks of this conference and how is another question. Not only its form but also the substance and content of the conference. I am hoping for the continuation of the dialogue with the United States on this issue.

You are well aware of what is impeding the holding of a conference. The chief obstacle is the fact that the Israeli leadership can in no way establish its position on a conference. The foreign minister is ostensibly in favor of it, the prime minister is opposed. But the process is not standing still, it is moving.

Now the answer to your second question. I have said that Comrade M.S. Gorbachev confirmed his readiness to meet with President Reagan within the timeframe agreed on in Washington. But primarily in order to achieve progress in the central salient—on reducing strategic offensive armaments and on the ABM Treaty. Here the signing of a treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles goes without saying.

Question: In your view, when specifically might work on the medium-range and operational-tactical missiles treaty be concluded?

Answer: At the concluding session we even estimated a deadline. True, this is always risky—mentioning deadlines in advance—but I believe that if the delegations apply themselves hard (and the Soviet delegation is prepared to act in precisely this plane) then in 2-3 weeks, maybe, a little more or a little less, it would be possible to complete the preparation of a draft agreement.

Question: If no progress is reached in the strategic offensive armaments and space sphere, does this mean that no medium-range missile agreement will be signed this year? If the answer is in the negative, does this not mean that the package untied by Gorbachev has been tied up again? That some kind of trade-off [uvyazka] is again needed?

Answer: If there is no agreement on strategic offensive weapons and the ABM Treaty, this in no way means that a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles cannot be signed. The when and the where is another question. I am convinced that it will undoubtedly be signed.

Question: Why have you now started to insist on linking progress in the strategic offensive armaments sphere with the SDI problem? After all, a summit could be held and a medium-range missile treaty signed right now. Could you say how you view progress in the SDI sphere? What specifically should happen to ensure that a summit takes place this year?

Answer: I think I have talked about this in sufficient detail. An agreement on medium-range missiles has almost been prepared. We are talking about subsequent major political actions: a summit between M.S. Gorbachev and President Reagan at which the main question, it seems to us, should be the reduction of strategic offensive weapons under the conditions of the observance and maintenance of the ABM Treaty. The next stage is that if President Reagan comes to Moscow to sign such an agreement then we must be concerned right now to ensure that it is ready. We need fundamental progress in a key area—the sphere of strategic offensive weapons and the strengthening of the ABM Treaty. Otherwise the prospects for signing an agreement on this central problem will remain vague. That is why we are insisting on the option I told you about.

Question: Can we assume that yet another meeting of foreign ministers will take place in the near future? And if so, when?

Answer: From the outset I have tried to answer this question diplomatically. Contacts are possible. The level of those contacts is a question we did not discuss. Perhaps at the deputy minister level, or perhaps at the ministerial level.

But contacts are undoubtedly necessary.

Question: The impression was created that the main obstacle to the conclusion of a strategic arms agreement is still the question of sublevels for ballistic missile warheads. Today this problem has not simply been removed but, if we go on the basis of what you have told us, the Soviet Union has gone much further toward resolving it than that which the Americans are proposing. Nonetheless, you have still encountered a negative position on the part of Washington. Could it be said that this is based not on these sublevels but on a desire to somehow undermine the ABM Treaty?

Answer: You have answered your own question. We are forced to admit that yes, that is the impression.

I think that the world public will react appropriately to this U.S. stance.

We must not permit the ABM Treaty to be undermined. This would essentially mean legalizing the program for the militarization of space. That must not be permitted.

Question: The U.S. secretary of state spoke here before you and he also talked about the important proposals submitted today by M.S. Gorbachev. He also said that Washington would be impatiently waiting for the mailman with a letter from Moscow. The impression is that Soviet proposals are made one after another, but the Americans are in no hurry to make their own proposals. Where are their proposals? Or did they propose something new today?

Answer: Since the secretary of state talked about a letter I have either to confirm or refute his words.

In submitting our proposal and citing specific figures Mikhail Sergeyevich said that in addition to the existing mechanisms for talks he was sending a personal message to the U.S. President in order to set forth once again the Soviet Union's position on this central problem and to express his personal attitude to the positions set forth at the Moscow talks... When this will be done, how, and in

what way the message will be sent is another matter. As for new proposals on the strategic offensive armaments and ABM issues, the U.S. side has indeed not made any.

Question: What is the main thing in the range of different questions currently separating the United States and the USSR in the strategic arms sphere or on the ABM Treaty? Is it right to say that there is a divergence in attitudes to the ABM Treaty? Mr Shultz came to that conclusion. Do you share it?

Answer: The main obstacle is indeed the attitude to the ABM Treaty.

Question: It would be fair to describe the secretary of state's reply as reflecting the feelings of someone disappointed that the Moscow talks followed hard on the heels of last month's successful Washington meeting. Why does the U.S. side think that a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles is sufficient for a summit this year?

Answer: This is the third time I have come back to this subject. The fact that this treaty will be concluded is not in doubt. That is why it is quite natural—and the Americans agreed with this back in Washington—that we decided to go further and schedule as the central problem on the agenda the sharp reduction of strategic offensive weapons and the related issue of the ABM Treaty. As for disappointments, there are no grounds for any. First, we discussed all questions in a businesslike way and conclusively determined the fate of a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles; second, we made very important proposals to the Americans on reductions in and the configuration of strategic offensive weapons, taking a big step toward meeting them halfway. After all, the April talks in Moscow between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and G. Shultz discussed the preparation of "key provisions" on strategic offensive armaments and ABM Treaty issues for a subsequent summit.

Question: Mr Shultz said that there had been progress with you in the human rights sphere. What was he talking about? What rights did he have in mind? The right of Jewish emigration from the USSR? Has there been any progress in that area?

Answer: If the secretary of state spoke of progress then he meant—and I agree with this—that the human rights question has been discussed at Soviet-U.S. talks, particularly in recent times, in a calm atmosphere and a constructive manner. This is very important.

We take a serious approach to the problems raised by the U.S. side, and, likewise, they listen to us when we talk about failures to observe human rights in the United States. At the Washington news conference G. Shultz said that the human rights issue, the humanitarian issue, is a "two-way street."

As for the so-called question of Jewish emigration, you who work in our country are probably up to date with what we are doing to improve legislation and with the various instructions and provisions, including in this sphere. In this regard I would like to remind you about the Bern meeting. Despite the fact that important documents were adopted at it with the participation of the Soviet Union, these did not come into force because of the position of the U.S. delegation, which essentially torpedoed the agreement. Nonetheless, we have pledged to carry out all the main demands of this document. The document relates to contacts between people, and we now call on everyone to adhere to these documents. That is how the situation looks in practice.

If one compares the figures on numbers of people emigrating in different years, it is clear that the problem is being solved. It is being solved on a legal basis. If somewhere some organizations or departments deviate from existing laws, then a USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium special commission comes into action. It examines and resolves all disputes.

Question: The TASS report on the CPSU Central Committee plenum names you and Mr Dobrynin among the 28 speakers. Does this mean that the plenum discussed the question of arms control and the possibility of a summit? Before the meeting with G. Shultz were any changes made to the position at the Soviet Union's talks with the United States with regard to the possibility of a summit?

Answer: I think you did not read the information report very carefully. Allow me to make a small clarification: Comrade A.F. Dobrynin took part in the work of the plenum but did not speak at it. As for my speech at the plenum, it was devoted to the draft of the report to be delivered by Comrade M.S. Gorbachev at the celebrations to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. A considerable proportion of this most important document will be devoted to the most acute problems of the day, including foreign policy problems and the foreign policy aspects of party and state activity at the contemporary stage—and a speech by a foreign minister on that score is more than natural.

Question: As is well known, 2 November marks the 70th anniversary of the tragic declaration for the Palestinian people made by British Foreign Secretary Balfour. The idea of creating a Jewish enclave on Palestinian territory was mooted 70 years ago. As is now clear from your speech and that of Mr Shultz, the convening of a conference on a peaceful settlement in the Near East has been overshadowed by the Iran-Iraq War. Next year marks the 40th anniversary of the State of Israel. Blood has been shed in the Near East throughout that period. Do you not think that we should not tackle one tragedy to the detriment of the other?

Answer: I agree with you. We must step up the Near East settlement process. Of course, the Iran-Iraq war and the situation in the Persian Gulf influence the state of affairs in the region, but it is possible to simultaneously step up the Near East settlement process and conduct preparations for convening an international conference.

Question: Both your friends and enemies in the Arab world believe that Soviet policy toward that area is changing somewhat. They note the rapprochement with Iran at a time when Kuwait—a neutral country—is suffering Iranian strikes. We see the Soviet Union signing a protocol on cooperation with Iran while demonstrating no readiness to adopt sanctions against it for its blatant refusal to fulfill Resolution 598. What can you say on that score?

Answer: The rumors and talk that the Soviet Union does not support the Arabs are utterly fictitious and groundless. We have excellent relations with the absolute majority of countries in the Arab world and nothing has changed on that as far as we are concerned. Our relations with Iraq are good and traditionally friendly. As for our ties with Iran, I think that their strengthening is a natural process: These are our neighbors and we must have good-neighborly relations with them.

Shevardnadze, Matlock Meet 27 October

LD271113 Moscow TASS in English 1107 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today invited the U.S. ambassador to the USSR, Jack Matlock, to conversation.

During the conversation they discussed issues of mutual interest.

Commentaries, Reaction to U.S.-USSR Talks

Ponomarev's View

PM261301 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 First Edition p 3

[Observer Manki Ponomarev military-political review: "The Peoples of the Planet Are Waiting For It"]

[Text] The most important problems perturbing all mankind appeared as if focused by a parabolic mirror, in concentrated form, in the Soviet-U.S. talks held in Moscow recently. There are many of these problems and they are varied. But the main one is sparing the world from the threat of nuclear catastrophe and ensuring the immortality of the human race.

Indeed, however confrontation and enmity may split the world, it can and must be united in the face of the need to preserve itself. All the rest recedes into the background in before this task, which has faced the world's peoples in all its magnitude and acuteness. An irrefutable fact is becoming increasingly obvious: Correctly understood national interests cannot be set against general human interests. Regional conflicts, the tasks of environmental conservation, the development of previously backward peoples, in brief everything we now call global problems, cannot be settled without curtailing the arms race, above all the nuclear arms race, and without reversing it.

By the logic of things this basic, main problem was the focus of the discussions during the talk between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz, which was devoted to the most important aspects of Soviet-U.S. relations and international politics. The talks between G. Shultz and his Soviet counterpart, Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze, were conducted in the same direction.

The elaboration of the fundamental provisions of the accord between the USSR and the United States on medium-range and shorter-range missiles was virtually completed at these talks. The two countries' delegations at the Geneva talks were instructed to complete work in the very near future on the text of the treaty on the elimination of these missiles.

It should be noted that some details of the Soviet-U.S. agreement remained unsettled until the very last moment. For instance, there were difficulties in agreeing on the article concerning each of the contracting sides' undertakings not to undertake any circumventing action to retain the classes of weapon to be eliminated, by handing them to third countries, for instance. Certain difficulties also arose in discussing other questions. They have now been overcome. The schedules for eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles and the procedure for destroying them have been agreed upon. There is also headway on the problem of verification and monitoring. Both sides concluded that the question of completing work on the treaty in the very near future is not giving rise to doubts.

Agreement on these questions enabled the participants in the Moscow talks to focus attention on the central, fundamental problem of Soviet-U.S. relations at the present stage. It is a case of the 50% reduction of strategic offensive arms under the conditions of the consolidation of the ABM Treaty regime, suggested back in Reykjavik. Whereas the treaty on the elimination of medium-range and shorter-range missiles affects approximately 2,000 Soviet and U.S. nuclear warheads, the agreement on strategic offensive armaments is far broader. Both sides believe that the question of strategic offensive armaments is a key one in ending the arms race.

Inasmuch as the question of reducing strategic armaments is closely linked with the problems of not putting weapons in space, during his talk with G. Shultz, M.S. Gorbachev submitted additional specific proposals with a view to finding ways out which satisfy both sides. Their

thrust is as follows: The United States agrees to enshrine in law the undertaking not to use for 10 years its right to withd aw from the ABM Treaty while strictly observing it. The USSR agrees to set limits to the number of warheads on individual types of strategic offensive armaments belonging to the USSR and the United States. Here it is ready to undertake that within the framework of the total limit of 6,000 warheads on the sides' strategic offensive armaments no more than 3,000-3,300 warheads should be placed on ICBM's, no more than 1,800-2,000 warheads should be placed on submarines' ballistic missiles, and no more than 800-900 warheads should be placed on air-launched cruise missiles.

With a view to strengthening the atmosphere of trust and in order to do away with any talk that the Soviet Union is allegedly violating the ABM Treaty by erecting the Krasnoyarsk Radar Station, M.S. Gorbachev told Shultz that the USSR is unilaterally introducing a year's moratorium on all work which is being done here. We naturally expect a similar step with regard to the U.S. radar station in Scotland.

Considering these new compromise initiatives, it was suggested that work be activated on coordinating positions in the field of strategic offensive armaments and space at the Geneva talks and at other levels. In order to ensure that at the meeting scheduled for this year between M.S. Gorbachev and the U.S. President it is possible, as well as signing a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, to enshrine an accord on the key positions of future agreements on strategic offensive armaments and on space which in turn could be signed during an answering visit to the Soviet Union by R. Reagan. [sentence as published]

The world public has now seen for itself that a breakthrough was indeed accomplished in Reykjavik a year ago. A breakthrough which has enabled the peoples to see, through the barriers of the nuclear age, the prospects of a new world—the world of the third millenium, a world without nuclear weapons. At the same time, when I heard U.S. Secretary of State G. Shultz's statement at the USSR Foreign Ministry Press Center in Moscow, it became obvious to me that the United States is still not ready to discuss on a businesslike and constructive basis the problems of preserving the ABM Treaty on a businesslike and constructive basis. That is the main obstacle on the path to elaborating key positions on the reduction of strategic offensive armaments.

At the talks in Moscow there was also a discussion of other problems and some of them the Western press views as very important. Thus U.S. State Department spokesman P. Oakley frankly called the conflict situation in the Persian Gulf "the main topic of the talks in Moscow."

It is for Oakley to decide what she considers to have been the main thing. But the situation in the Persian Gulf region is indeed so explosive that it required close attention from both countries.

Before talking about how the discussion of regional problems proceeded in Moscow, I should like to recall that it was exactly 4 years ago, 25 October 1983, that the U.S. military intervention against Grenada began. The war machine of the world's mightiest capitalist power was brought down on the tiny island republic. As a result Grenada was occupied and procedures were established there in line with Washington's ideas about the peoples' rights. "The recklessness of force" was how the world public described the United States' actions in Grenada. Today the "recklessness of force" is determining the United States' policy and practical actions in the Persian Gulf.

Only recently we were saying that the senseless war between Iran and Iraq was the reason for the dangerous situation which has taken shape here. But now a new factor has been added—the United States' military presence in the region and its armed interference in events taking place here. The U.S. warships' attack on Iran's oil platforms, sanctioned by the President as supreme commander in chief of the U.S. Armed Forces, has essentially turned Washington into a participant in the military conflict. Yet the United States is a permanent member of the UN Security Council and in this capacity bears special responsibility for maintaining international peace and security.

The attack on Iranian oil platforms and other military actions in the Persian Gulf have generated in the United States a wave of chauvinism on whose crest the most aggressive militarist circles are active. They are the same forces which are resisting changes in the international arena, influential forces blinded by hatred for everything progressive, the forces mentioned by M.S. Gorbachev in his speech in Murmansk. ""They exist in various circles of the Western world," he pointed out. "But their greatest concentration is among those who directly serve the military-industrial complex ideologically and politically and who live on it, so to speak."

These forces are trying to wreck the nuclear arms agreements between the USSR and the United States. They are steering a course toward the further hiking of the arms race. They are nurturing far-reaching designs for "compensating" for the losses which will allegedly occur if a Soviet-U.S. agreement on eliminating medium-range and shorter-range missiles is signed. Threats are being heard that this agreement's ratification will be thwarted in the U.S. Senate. It is staggering, but it is precisely at this time, with which the peoples link their hopes for a peaceful future, that Washington is deciding to begin the assembly of binary chemical munitions.

The interests of the military-industrial complex protrude, like a hare's ears from a conjurer's top hat, from the statements of some U.S. figures to the effect that they do not intend to abandon nuclear tests. In their opinion, *The New York Times* writes, a ban on nuclear tests can be achieved only in the 21st century. Meanwhile it is becoming known that the U.S. Armed Forces are selecting targets for delivering nuclear strikes and are planning actions by submarines and surface ships equipped with ballistic missiles and Tomahawk cruise missiles with nuclear warheads. According to the Japanese newspaper *Asahi*, special services belonging to the Hawaii-based U.S. Armed Forces Pacific and Indian Ocean command are in particular engaged in this.

All this requires money, money, and more money. The immoderate military expenditure is leading to an increase in the U.S. federal budget deficit. This deficit has already exceeded $200 billion and has become one reason for the panic on the stock exchange which gripped the financial capitals of the capitalist world early this week. As yet the results of this panic cannot be calculated. But it is not for nothing that observers are recalling the 1929 stock exchange collapse which heralded the capitalist world's entry into a world economic crisis of unprecedented depth.

No, the peoples of the world are not waiting for further rounds of the arms race. It is time to clear the road to each other using not only Soviet but also U.S. bulldozers. Moscow is firmly convinced that something is changing for the better in Soviet-U.S. relations. They are becoming more dynamic. All this instills a certain hope for the future.

The peoples can see that the new thinking by which the Soviet Union is guided in international affairs is blazing a trail for itself into life. It is already embodied in specific deeds and after all the unity of word and deed is a determining feature of Soviet policy in general and the USSR's foreign policy in particular. But we must struggle for success. We must boldly discard everything outdated and obsolete in international relations, including relations between the USSR and the United States, and orient ourselves toward the new, toward the realities of our time, toward the interests of the present and future generations.

PRAVDA's Zhukov Cited

PM261513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 87 Second Edition p 6

[Yuriy Zhukov "Political Diary": "Nearing the Target"; boldface as published]

[Text] Yesterday and the day before, the teletype machines bringing to newspaper editorial offices and radio and television stations reports from news agencies and their own correspondents were chattering incessantly. From all four corners of the world reaction has been coming in to the Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow 22-23 October, which are universally regarded as an important event. The highlight of these talks was the 5-hour meeting between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of our party Central Committee, and G. Shultz, U.S. secretary of state.

Pravda readers are already familiar with the content of these intensive and dynamic talks and with their results, which both sides regard as constructive. Every unbiased person who ponders them will see for himself that the path taken in the development of Soviet-U.S. relations from Geneva via Reykjavik to the present day offers the prospect of the conclusion of far-reaching agreements leading to a sharp reduction in the universal nuclear danger.

You only have to compare the course and results of the Moscow talks with what we observed several years ago to see the great changes that have already taken place. The accords reached in Reykjavik ensured the positive development of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue.

Now, when the preparation of a treaty on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles is nearing completion, general attention has focused on the next, central problem on whose solution the ensuring of universal security will greatly depend. This is the profound—50%!—reduction of the two countries' strategic offensive armaments. Both the USSR and the United States consider this problem crucial to the prevention of the nuclear arms race.

What must be done to ensure a successful solution to this task without long delay, a solution which is urged with such fervent hope at rallies and demonstrations of participants in the "Peace Wave" which has swept the whole world?

There is one prime need in that respect at the moment: It is time to clear the road between us using not only Soviet but also U.S. bulldozers, as M.S. Gorbachev said.

In fact, our country has been putting forward one peace initiative after another. This time, too, a whole series of new ideas have been proposed, and, if implemented, would ensure progress in the nuclear disarmament sphere at a forthcoming summit meeting. But what did the U.S. side bring with it to Moscow?

One correspondent at the press conference given 23 October by USSR Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze asked the following question: "The Soviets have proposals which are submitted one after another but the Americans are in no hurry with their own. Indeed, where are their proposals? Or did they propose something new today?" The answer was: The U.S. side submitted no new proposals on strategic offensive armaments and ABM questions.

I would go further: With regard to the Moscow talks, President Reagan said in conversation with West European journalists that during the meeting some progress was made on the path of concluding an agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles but, asked whether he is ready to alter his stance on the "Star Wars" preparation program so as to remove the obstacles to progress at the strategic arms talks, he said: **"No."**

The U.S. side also said **"no"** to the new Soviet proposal to proclaim a moratorium as of 1 November on all work connected with the production, testing, and deployment of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles since the preparation of a treaty on their elimination is now being completed. After all, if this proposal were adopted, the whole world would see the treaty working even before it was enshrined in law.

Finally, the U.S. side said **"no"** in connection with M.S. Gorbachev's remark that in reply to the Soviet declaration of a 1-year moratorium on all work connected with the construction of the Krasnoyarsk radar station, the Soviet side expects a similar step with regard to the U.S. radar station in Scotland.

It is time indeed to understand that the hasty rejection of the Soviet initiatives is contrary to the spirit of the times. As was remarked during the meeting between the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and the U.S. secretary of state, we are now at a very crucial stage when the maximum attentiveness and mutual understanding are needed from both sides so that the opportunity which has already been missed once is not missed again.

The Soviet side has now presented concrete proposals whose implementation promises the radical improvement not only of Soviet-U.S. relations but also of the international situation as a whole. The preparation of the text of the treaty for the elimination of medium-range and operational-tactical missiles can and must be completed in the next few weeks. The coordination of positions on strategic offensive weapons and space can and must be stepped up in parallel and without delay in Geneva and at other levels. Then at the Soviet-U.S. summit planned for this year a treaty can and must be signed on medium-range and operational-tactical missiles, just as an accord can and must be achieved on the key aspects of future agreements on strategic offensive weapons and space. Finally, those documents could be signed during a reciprocal visit to the USSR by President R. Reagan.

How will Washington reply to this? The ball is in its court.

Chernyshev Comments

LD261724 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1512 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow: 26 Oct—Vladimir Chernyshev, TASS military affairs observer, writes:

Since the conclusion of the Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow, certain Western mass information media have been interpreting their outcome in, to put it mildly, a highly original fashion. I would like to examine just what really did happen in the Soviet capital.

A certain amount of progress was achieved at the talks, and on the whole they were useful and productive. In particular, a number of very serious obstacles to finalizing an agreement on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles were overcome, and a date was set for beginning broad talks on nuclear tests. The USSR took a very large step towards achieving an agreement on a sharp reduction of strategic offensive arms: it tabled new and fundamentally important proposals on determining the numbers of warheads in the part of the strategic triad—figures which are very close to the stances proposed more than once by the U.S. Administration.

The statement by the Soviet side that progress on the main regions of arms reduction—preparing the key provisions of an agreement on strategic offensive weapons and preserving the ABM Treaty—is needed for there to be a Soviet-U.S. summit can hardly have come as a surprise to the U.S. leadership. Indeed, at the Moscow talks this April, attention was drawn to the fact that this was a fundamental problem; and in Washington this September it was stipulated that it would be discussed in detail at the next meeting, the one in Moscow.

Regarding the ABM Treaty, the position of the USSR on this important document remains consistent and principled. Both in Reykjavik and at subsequent talks the Soviet Union has invariably stated that the treaty must be preserved in its original form and that it must not be withdrawn from for a minimum of 10 years. Allowing the ABM Treaty to be undermined means legalizing the militarizing of space. Having shown flexibility and constructiveness, the USSR has met the United States halfway by proposing the definition of a concrete list of installations that would be banned from being put into space.

Was all this really not known in Washington? Of course everything was clear. But, they preferred nto to pause and consider what was well known and clear. Calmly accepting the constructive shifts in the Soviet position, they completely failed to pause and consider that ultimately talks are a two-way road, and that Washington should also respond to the Soviet position. So now at the talks in Moscow, the U.S. side not only did not contribute any new proposals for reducing strategic offensive weapons and strengthening the ABM Treaty, but was not even willing to discuss the issues proposed by the Soviet Union to preserve the ABM Treaty.

It is time for Washington to recognize and take into account the existing link between strategic offensive and defensive weapons. After all, this link can not be

destroyed by any kind of "dreams" about an "impenetrable space shield" and propaganda statements to the effect that nuclear weapons will allegedly become "useless and unnecessary" in the event of such a "shield" being deployed in low orbit. The space strike weapons which are being developed in the SDI program are, by nature, offensive weapons which will be capable of being used for the sudden elimination of targets in space, on earth, in the atmosphere, and at sea. These global weapons can quickly appear over the territory of any state and threaten its security. To legitimize their development in a legal international document and, meanwhile to agree to deep reductions of strategic offensive forces would be to forgo one's own security. This truth must finally be perceived in Washington as an objective reality, and not provoke far-fetched expressions of astonishment and disappointment.

Zholkver: 'First Step'

LD262005 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Commentary by Political Commentator Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The most current topic of conversation in Washington now is the word disappointment. As CBS television put it, all members of the U.S. delegation are lost in conjecture—where did the breakdown occur? It seems to me, however, that such statements smack of demagoguery and hypocrisy.

What actually happened during Secretary of State Shultz's talks in Moscow? I attended the press conference held by Shultz and Comrade Shevardnadze and I should say first and foremost that they both expressed satisfaction with both the very atmosphere of the present round of Soviet-U.S. talks, particularly with the 5-hour conversation with Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, and with the certain progress achieved. Primarily, they managed to overcome the very serious obstacles that had arisen at the Geneva talks on medium and shorter-range missiles.

Now one can say that the treaty on scrapping these two classes of nuclear weapons is virtually ready. This alone is a great and gratifying event. But everyone understands that this is only the beginning, only the first step, that affects merely 3% of both sides' nuclear arms. Now it is a question of advancing further toward substantial reductions, by half, as we propose in strategic offensive armaments. It was precisely such a route toward disarmament that we proposed in Reykjavik, at Comrade Shevardnadze's recent talks in Washington, and at the meeting in Moscow. For our part, things are not confined to good wishes alone.

This time, too, Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev submitted new, specific proposals to set upper limits on the quantity of warheads on all types of the strategic triad, on intercontinental ballistic missiles, and on submarines and strategic bombers. In order to set about limiting armaments immediately, without waiting to sign the relevant agreements, a bilateral moratorium was proposed on the production, deployment, and testing of at least two classes of nuclear missiles.

But did the United State propose anything new? I asked Comrade Shevardnadze this question at the press conference and, unfortunately, he answered in the negative. So with whom are they now taking umbrage in Washington as they mourn there the fact that Shultz did not manage to agree in Moscow on a concrete date for the next Soviet-U.S. summit meeting? Such a meeting has to produce results, after all. As Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev put it, not only Soviet but also U.S. bulldozers have to be used to clear the path, to meet each other halfway. Unfortunately in Washginton, despite the patently put on expression of disappointment, they are still working in the opposite direction.

Shishlin Interviewed

LD252129 Prague Television Service in Czech 1830 GMT 25 Oct 87

[Interview with Nikolay Shishlin, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Propaganda Department, by unidentified television correspondent via direct link from CSSR television's Studio 6 in Kavci Hory with the Moscow studio in Ostankino; correspondent's questions and Shishlin's answers in Russian with superimposed Czech translation—live; video not available]

[Text] [Correspondent] Good evening. Last week you spoke in Prague about the perspectives of Soviet-U.S. relations and about the upcoming meetings. To what extent have your views been shown to be correct?

[Shishlin] This is not an easy question, because the meeting, on the one hand, fulfilled some expectations, and on the other hand we were also dissapointed in some things. Above all I would like to say that the thing we talked about in Prague—that is the treaty on medium- and shorter-range missiles—these prerequisites were fulfilled. Very significant work was done and in essence we can say that the agreement is coming very close to readiness. According to the evaluation of our foreign minister, 2-3 weeks will be needed in order to complete this work. Progress on the question of strategic offensive weapons was considerably tangible, but much remains blocked by the well-known U.S. attitude, that is the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative [SDI]. The United States continues to speak about readiness to put an end to the arms race on earth but it keeps its plans for the militarization of space active. This naturally casts a deep shadow on Soviet-U.S. relations, although I repeat that much of waht was expected and what we spoke to you about in Prague has become fact.

[Correspondent] The first reactions to the results of the talks are varied. What is your opinion? Can one talk about success in the talks or not?

[Shishlin] Well, personally I would look for some other definition of the results of the talks. They were truly of a working, deep, and substantial character, and I am thinking of both the talks between the foreign ministers and the 5-hour conversation that Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev had with U.S. Secretary of State Shultz. I believe that we now have a better understanding of our mutual standpoints. In this case the things discussed in Moscow were not some types of abstract concepts but practical approaches to the cardinal problems which weigh heavily on both international relations as such, and Soviet-U.S. relations.

In some things, as I have already said, we have achieved tangible progress, but in the key problems, such as the problem of a considerable limitation of strategic offensive weapons, progress there is of course insufficient. We consider our standpoint to be logical. We consider it necessary to go step by step toward an absolute liquidation of nuclear weapons and under these conditions there cannot even be a thought of any kind of defense against ballistic missiles. One day these ballistic missiles will not even exist, but the United States claims that it intends to work, and will work on the development of a shield, on the development of a reliable defense from strategic offensive weapons. Thus they are naturally preserving all their Star Wars plans, that is plans for the militarization of space, and that, naturally is a strategic relevance. Here it is necessary over and over again to visualize the concept advocated by Washington and to visualize the ideas which are being proposed by Moscow. This is why I think that on the whole tangible progress was made in Moscow during the 2 days, although perhaps not as extensive as we ourselves have liked.

[Correspondent] In contrast to the meeting in Washington, where a calendar of future talks was set out, this is not the case in Moscow. So what is to follow?

[Shishlin] I think that both Moscow and Washington now need to consider in detail the results of the talks. The things we are talking about here today are naturally first impressions, the first ideas about these talks. The Soviet-U.S. dialogue is continuing; it will continue on a higher level now, on a higher level of understanding problems. Then, I think, that perspectives for new meetings between the Soviet and the U.S. side will naturally open up. We do not consider either the question or the perspective of a summit meeting to be closed.

Shultz Evaluation

LD260023 Moscow TASS in English 2210 GMT 25 Oct 87

[Text] New York October 26 TASS—TASS correspondent Andrey Chytov reports:

U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz on Sunday gave an interview to the NBC network. On the whole, he positively assessed the outcome of his just-ended trip to Moscow, pointing out that during the talks the sides succeeded in making progress on substantial issues of relations between the USSR and the United States. Shultz optimistically evaluated the chances for concluding a Soviet-U.S. agreement on medium-range and shorter-range missiles, saying that almost all problems in its way have already been settled.

A question was put to the head of the U.S. foreign policy department whether the stance of Reagan who refuses even to discuss the possibility of imposing restrictions on tests under the "Star Wars" programme, seemed nonconstructive to him. In his reply Shultz opposed any such restrictions.

The issue of what will be happening during the period of non-withdrawal from the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Limitation of Anti-Ballistic Missile Systems (ABM) should, in our view, be covered by the treaty itself, Shultz stated. He said that the United States did not seek any changes in the ABM Treaty and considered that it should not be revised. He said that since the point at issue was research in which there was a good deal of the unknown, something could be banned but then be bitterly regretted about what was done.

Replying to another question, the U.S. secretary of state pointed out that the administration did not intend to renounce the realization of President Reagan's "Strategic Defence Initiative".

In discussing regional issues, Shultz justified U.S. military presence in the Persian Gulf. He made it clear that numbered days remained before the United Nations for imposing an international embargo on weapons supplies to Iran.

Reagan's Comments Noted

LD270327 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0257 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Washington, 27 Oct (TASS)—President Reagan on Monday expressed the conviction that a Soviet-U.S. treaty on medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles "will be signed." In an interview to a number of leading West European television companies, the head of the U.S. Administration noted that the participants in the Soviet-U.S. talks "it appears, have removed all large divergences." In the words of the President, following the meetings and discussions in Moscow which took place last week, "a few small details remain to be polished off. However, we consider that an agreement will be signed."

At the same time the President repeated his known position with regard to the "Star Wars" program, which has turned into an obstacle in the central direction of the talks. He once again stated that he will not allow the SDI

to be turned into a "bargaining chip." [Moscow Television Service in Russian at 0257 GMT on 27 October, as part of its "Novosti" newscast, carries this same item, but ends it at the phrase "...regard to the 'Star Wars' program."]

U.S. Carries Out 13th 1987 Nuclear Blast

LD232035 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Washington October 23 TASS—As a spokesman for the U.S. Energy Department said, an underground nuclear blast was conducted at the Nevada test range on Friday. The yield of the charge detonated at a depth of nearly 600 meters was from 20 to 100 kilotons.

The nuclear test code-named Borate has been the 13th officially announced blast to have been conducted in the United States of America in the current year. This time a warning on possible soil tremor in the areas adjoining the test range was issued. As the UPI agency said, such notifications appeared earlier in the cases when the yield of blasts reached 150 kilotons.

U.S. Launches Titan Booster Rocket 26 Oct

LD270836 Moscow TASS in English 0745 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] San Francisco October 27 TASS—Spokesmen for the U.S. Air Force officially notified that booster rocket Titan-34D with secret cargo on board was launched from the launching pad of Vandenberg Air Force Base in California on Monday. The Titan booster rockets are designed first and foremost for putting into near-earth orbit big spy satelites for the needs of the CIA and the Pentagon. The load of the launched booster rocket was precisely such an electronic space spy codenamed KH-11, the UPI agency said. It carries photography of objectives on the territory of the USSR and the other socialist countries. By its latest launching the Pentagon has resumed the large-scale program for placing in outer space of espionage equipment of the new generation, which was interrupted by the disaster of the reusable space shuttle *Challenger* in January 1986 and the unsuccessful launchings of the Titan booster rocket in 1985-86.

Reagan Cited on Stock Market, Gulf, SDI

LD231439 Moscow TASS in English 1416 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Washington October 23 TASS—U.S. President Ronald Reagan addressed a press conference here Thursday devoted chiefly to a deep financial and economic crisis that plagued this week all of the key stock markets of the capitalist world. "Over the past several days, we Americans have watched the stock market toss and turn", said the head of the administration. "We should not assume that the stock market's excess volatility is over", he said adding that there still "remains cause for concern".

One of the journalist asked the following question: Mr President, the stock market plunge demonstrates that there is a crisis of confidence about economic stability and the leadership of our government. Are those fears warranted, and how serious is the threat of a recession or something worse?

Reagan replied that he did not think that there was any real reason for those fears. He described the gravest crisis that mushroomed into the stock market panic, which is unprecedented in many years, as a "long-overdue correction". "There are no indicators out there of recession", the President contended, although according to a White House forecast prepared for him (news of the forecast reached American journalists), a new slump threatens to start as early as next spring.

The head of the administration announced that he was going to begin talks with the U.S. Congress on bringing down the country's state budget deficit. In general opinion, this deficit is a key reason behind the instability of the U.S. economy as well as the current stock market crisis. Democratic lawmakers have long since been pushing for talks on reducing the deficit. And following the outbreak of the stock exchange panic, Wall Street, foreign governments and even leaders of Reagan's Republican Party heavily pressurized the White House into giving consent to such talks. In an attempt to quell the panic the President bowed to these demands simultaneously accusing Democrats in Congress of being responsible for federal budget deficits which under the Reagan administration snowballed from 58.5 billion dollars in fiscal 1981 to 221 billion in fiscal 1986.

Reagan announced at the press conference that the final deficit figures for fiscal year 1987, which ended on September 30, showed a reduction to 148 billion. But this year it threatens to soar again to 163 billion, according to the administration's forecasts, and—to 179 billion as was estimated by Congress.

Since the escalation of the stock market crisis was triggered by U.S. Navy attack on Iranian oil rigs in the Persian Gulf, the President assured: "We're not there to start a war". Charging Iran with "provocative actions", however, he reaffirmed that the United States was going to take retaliatory measures. Replying to a question by a correspondent on "any limits on the U.S. involvement in the Persian Gulf", Reagan said that he could tell him "how long this escort operation is going to continue?" "We've had naval forces there since 1949", he recalled, adding that the United States would continue to have them "as long as it is necessary". "Since 1978 there have been a few more than 200 military actions by the United States in foreign countries", the President said.

One of the questions put to Reagan dealt with the administration's policy with regard to the "Star Wars" programme: Now that an INF deal is all but wrapped up, the next step would be strategic weapons. The Soviets have said that they are willing to give you the big cuts in

those missiles that you have always wanted if you would agree to some limits on strategic defence testing. Why have you told your negotiators that they cannot even discuss this issue with the Soviets?

Reagan's reply testified that the administration was seeking as before to put the plans to develop space weapons in the United States beyond an agreement with the USSR.

Oakley, XINHUA on Silkworm Supplies to Iran

LD231655 Moscow TASS in English 1626 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Washington October 23 TASS—Phillis Oakley, a spokesman for the U.S. State Department, made a statement at the latest briefing, claiming that the oil terminal off Kuwait's coast designed to handle supertankers was hit by a Chinese-made Silkworm missile. She also said that the United States of America had repeatedly expressed to the PRC its concern over the developments in the Persian Gulf and the use of Chinese Silkworm missiles by Iran.

Over the period of aggravation of tensions in the Persian Gulf, Oakley continued, the United States of America decided not to revise the question of a certain liberalisation of control of modern technology exports to China. The rate and the tentative liberalisation schedule, the spokesman for the U.S. State Department noted, will be, certainly, varied, as was the case in the past too.

Commenting on that statement, the newspaper *The New York Times* quoted the Reagan administration as saying that it had introduced restrictions on the export to China of some types of high-technology products. According to the officials, this is a response to the continued sale by China to Iran of antiship Silkworm missiles.

Simultaneously the newspaper quotes administration officials as saying that the White House intends to ban the bulk of trade with Iran.

Yet threats of this kind have long been issued. Despite all talk about measures against Iran, last summer that country, according to the figures of the U.S. Commerce Department, was the second biggest supplier of oil to the United States. As a result, the newspaper *The Washington Post* said, Tehran received more than 700 million dollars and that money was used to purchase and produce weapons, to continue the bloody war, to an end of which, as U.S. representatives claim, the United States of America is seeking to contribute.

The Irangate scandal brought to light the scope of the clandestine shipments of U.S. made weapons to Iran directly or via Israel. Once, the newspaper *The Washington Post* recalls, the supply from Israel of spares for F-4 aircraft enabled the Iranian Airforce to take off. Clandestine trade in arms continued also in March this year, the NBC telelvision company said, precisely at a time when spokesmen for the administration solemnly assured that the unlawful supplies had been terminated.

According to the CBS television company, an investigation is currently under way in connecton with the reports that Iranian speed boats used for attacking tankers are equipped with engines made in the United States of America. According to the estimates of the U.S. Customs Service, thousands of U.S.-made suspended motors were shipped to Iran via third countries.

Information appeared in the U.S. press also to the effect that Iran had received U.S. Stinger missiles with the assistance of Afghan counter-revolutionaries. As Iran's Ambassador to the PRC Alaedin Broujerdi said, Iran had obtained "by far more" of such missiles than was reported earlier, the UPI agency reported from Beijing. Early this month a U.S. helicopter was downed over the Persian Gulf with one of such missiles, the *Islamic Republic* news agency said.

Beijing October 23 TASS [dateline as received]—*Xinhua News Agency*, commenting on the State Department decision, said: "Local observers believe that it is not at all reasonable for the United States to stop the revision of the issue of liberalization of control over high technology exports to China under the pretext of the growing tensions in the Gulf.

"Everyone knows that the present-day tensions in the Gulf were brought about by the continued and stepped-up Iran-Iraq war and by intensified military interference by great powers there. In fact, liberalisation of control over high technology exports to China has nothing to do with the situation in the Gulf".

U.S. 'Neoglobalist Doctrine' at Work in Gulf

LD232114 Moscow World Service in English 1610 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] In his replies to journalists' questions at a news conference held on 22 October, President Reagan formulated the official aims of the United States' policy in the Persian Gulf. He declared that the United States is there not for the purpose of launching war. More from our observer, Aleksandr Pogodin:

It would be good if the President's statement finished at that. Yet the numerous buts and ifs that accompanied it puts the accuracy of the formula to doubt. Indeed, all the reservations made could be boiled down to one thing: Any attempt to block American actions in the Gulf will be responded [to] by a large scale use of force on the part of the United States. The President declared that his country acted very well in that region. He probably implied attacks on Iranian gunboats, the destruction of oil platforms, and people's deaths. White House officials

evidently think that there is no need to worry about such things. President Reagan said he did not think that could lead to a war or anything else, or that there was any reason to go panicking.

But there is also another version, the Iranian one. In Tehran, American military actions have been assessed as direct involvement in a war against Iran. Iran does not want this war, Iranian officials point out in their statements, but it will respond to these actions by its strikes of retribution. We would have liked to compare the Washington and Tehran assessments of the situation. Their fundamentally controversial nature testifies in itself to the extreme degree of tension, to the fact that a situation may get out of control. On 22 October an official spokesman for the American State Department said there was a possibility of a large-scale military escalation in the Gulf. What is required now, it seems, is the maximum of political realism. Statements by the President at the news conference, however, leave no illusions on that score. He stated that American naval forces would remain in the Gulf as long as it was required by the need to protect American interests there.

As one may see, the neoglobalist doctrine of the United States is still in action.

China

USSR-U.S. Arms Accord Welcomed

OW262037 Moscow International Service in Mandarin 0100 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Kuchin commentary]

[Text] While delivering a report on the work of the CPC Central Committee to the 13th CPC Congress, Zhao Ziyang, acting general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, welcomed the accord on medium-range guided missiles and on tactical and strategic guided missiles reached between the Soviet Union and the United States. In this connection, our station observer Kuchin says:

Almost all countries of the world welcome this accord. Chinese leaders have expressed their approval on many occasions, but this time it is very significant because China indicated its approval in the report on the work of the CPC Central Committee, a report very important to the Chinese people. This shows that China attaches great importance to the first step taken by mankind toward eliminating nuclear weapons in accordance with the proposals of the Soviet Union.

This decision of the Chinese leadership explicitly demonstrates that China's position against the threat of nuclear weapons is gradually becoming identical with that of the Soviet Union. In this respect our two countries share a common, ultimate goal; that is, the elimination of nuclear weapons. In many respects our two countries have adopted similar approaches toward achieving this goal. These approaches are: China and the Soviet Union have undertaken the commitment not to be the first to use nuclear weapons. When the Soviet Union announced a unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing, China also indicated that it would exercise restraint on nuclear testing. The Soviet Union and China support the establishment of a nuclear-free zone. Their objective and means of achieving this objective are similar because the social systems of our two big countries are similar. To further improve socialism, both the peoples of China and the Soviet Union need a sound, lasting peace, which provides an objective basis for the two countries to adopt a similar stand and, possibly, to cooperate in containing the threat of nuclear weapons.

While welcoming the Soviet-U.S. accord mentioned above, the Chinese Communists pointed out that this accord still can not put an end to the arms race and that it is necessary to go through a long, difficult road before true detente can be achieved. The Soviet Union knows that the road toward a nuclear-free world is difficult, but it will work unrelentingly to help mankind achieve this goal at an early date.

While the Soviet Union and the United States are strengthening the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, an important immediate task for them is to reduce their offensive strategic weapons by 50%. It should be pointed out that the Soviet Union and China share a common stand on this respect. China has long indicated that it hopes the Soviet Union and the United States will reduce their nuclear weapons by 50%. Like the Soviet Union, China endorses the adoption of measures to prevent the militarization of space. The people of the Soviet Union believe that the time will come when all nuclear powers will work unrelentingly together to create a nuclear-free world.

Shevardnadze Receives PRC Ambassador

LD261632 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1541 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today received Yu Hongliang, ambassador of the People's Republic of China, at the latter's request.

The Soviet leadership, Shevardnadze said, intended to make further efforts for the relationship between the USSR and the PRC to acquire the nature of consistent goodneighborly cooperation.

Taking note of progress in developing state-to-state relations and contacts, both sides expressed content with broadened exchanges of the experience of building socialism.

In the Soviet Union, the USSR foreign minister said, they are following the progress of the transformations in the PRC with great interest and they wish for successes

in the work of the 13th CPC Congress. Hu Hongliang expressed his best wishes to the Soviet people in connection with the upcoming 70th anniversary of Great October.

As international issues were discussed, the ambassador of the PRC was briefed on the results of Soviet-U.S. talks in Moscow and on new Soviet peace initiatives furnishing the basis for headway in removing the global nuclear danger.

In China, the ambassador said, they welcomed dialogue between the USSR and the U.S. and their agreement in principle on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

13th CPC Congress Discusses Main Report

LD261706 Moscow TASS in English 1516 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Beijing October 26 TASS—TASS correspondents Grigoriy Arslanov and Gennadiy Krivosheyev report:

The 13th Congress of the Communist Party of China is in session. Its delegates today continue discussing in groups the main report which was delivered yesterday by Acting General Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China Zhao Ziyang. The important problems, facing the whole party and the people, which were touched upon in the report are being studied and considered, along with the delegates of the congress, also by representatives of various state institutions and socio-political organizations, specially invited for the forum of the Chinese Communists.

The XINHUA news agency reports that the delegates note a realistic approach to solving complicated socio-economic questions, which was demonstrated in the main report. Delegates underline the significance and vital importance of the proposal, made in the report, on delineating the functions of party and administrative bodies, which is the key to the reform of the political set up of the country. It is noted that delineation of functions will enable the managers of administrative agencies to fuller display their role in solving different problems.

A press conference for Chinese and foreign journalists, accredited at the press centre of the Congress, was held here today. It was attended by senior officials of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China and the State Council of the People's Republic of China. Questions pertaining to the reform of the system of prices, agricultural production and land tenure were touched upon. Deputy Chairman of the State Committee on Transforming the Economic Management System of the People's Republic of China Gao Shangquan said that the Chinese Government was elaborating measures to stablise the economy and prices. He said the Chinese people felt concern over the growth of prices, therefore the economic reform will continue in conditions of ensuring stability of prices on the whole.

Explaining the policy of the Communist Party of China in private enterprise and hire of labour force, Gao Shangquan said that in China there were notions of labour force hire and unearned incomes, but these differ in that form or other from the similar notions in capitalist countries. The difference is that private enterprises in China are closely linked with social property and under its great influence. Labour force in the People's Republic of China is hired in accordance with state laws and decrees. The question of the number of workers of private enterprises is now being studied, he said.

Du Rensheng, director of the Agricultural Policy Studies Centre under the Secretariat of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, has said that a considerable quantity of the labour force of the Chinese countryside goes over to the industrial sector in the process of development of enterprises of rural districts and settlements. Many peasants give up contracts for land tenure which leads to the problem of handing over rights to land tenure to other persons. In this connection he underlined that this is not the sale of land in this case. He who received an additional plot of land in some cases pays compensation for the means, spent for perfection of irrigation and other systems on the plot, to its former "owners".

U.S. Pressure Over Arms to Iran

LD261759 Moscow TASS in English 1605 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Beijing October 26 TASS—Striving to shift from itself the responsibility for a conflict in the Persian Gulf, the United States groundlessly tries to accuse China of selling arms to Iran and threatens to review the question of supplying the PRC with U.S. military know-how. This is said in a XINHUA commentary circulated here today.

The news agency writes that mutual advantage is the condition and the basis for the maintenance of friendly relations between China and the USA also for the exchange and cooperation in the area of science and technology. But definite circles in the USA apparently view the transfer of equipment to China as alms and try to take advantage of it as a lever for pressure on the RPC. Such a stand can be described as ultimate absurdity and stupidity.

The XINHUA commentary says that China invariably declares for an early end to the Iran-Iraq war. The PRC Government declared more than once that it had never supplied nor would supply armaments to any of the warring sides. As to the United States, it should check what amounts of armaments it sold to some or other warring side, XINHUA writes in conclusion.

More Attention to Combating Bureaucracy

PM271355 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Combating Bureaucracy. Article Published in RENMIN RIBAO"]

[Text] Beijing, 22 Oct—Now that important transformations are taking place in the country as a result of the reform, the ugly phenomenon that is bureaucracy deserves increasing attention and resolute condemnation, *Renmin Ribao*, the organ of the CPC Central Committee, writes today. As a result of various kinds of bureauctic forms and methods of work, the state is sustaining considerable material and moral losses. Red tape, a lack of the necessary initiative, and incompetence are entailing grave consequences. It was this which was the main cause of the scandalous incident when 2,300 sets of expensive imported equipment were left unsupervised at Shanghai port and also of the recent explosion at a textile factory in Harbin as a result of which 58 people died and damage totaling 8.82 million yuan was caused to the state.

"Now no one can doubt any longer," *Renmin Ribao* emphasizes, "that rather than merely being a negative phenomenon, bureaucracy is a grave evil. Since the foundation of the PRC, several campaigns to combat bureaucracy have been launched; however, it has not proved possible to eradicate it. The main reason for this situation lies in the fact that no serious sanctions were applied to the bureaucrats. At present the PRC Criminal Code contains a special article in accordance with which bureaucrats must be made answerable and strictly punished in accordance with the letter of the law. Do not let individual leaders hope that bureaucracy, like a shield, will cover up their mistakes." Resolute and constant struggle against bureaucracy, the newspaper points out, is one of the most urgent tasks of the present time.

Armed Forces Rectification Campaign

PM271049 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Newspaper Report"]

[Text] On the eve of the opening of the 13th CPC Congress the regulation of party ranks in the Chinese Army, which has been conducted over the past 4 years, has come to an end. This has been reported by the Army newspaper *Jiefangjun Bao*.

"The main results of the campaign which has been conducted," the newspaper stresses, "have been the attainment of unity in understanding the party's line, course, and policy since the Third Plenum of the CPC Central Committee of the 11th convocation and the improvement of party members' ideological-political standard and awareness. The 'Great Cultural Revolution' has also been rejected and unity has been strengthened inside and outside the Army, there has been a rectification of pernicious style, the glorious traditions of the party and Army have been further developed, the building of leading groups has been stepped up, the militancy of party organizations has been enhanced, and the 'people of three categories'—supporters of the Lin Biao and Jiang Qing—have been resolutely purged.

Jiefangjun Bao notes that "Army party organizations are now obliged to comprehensively generalize the experience of the regulation of party ranks which has been carried out and to introduce into the daily practice of party work forms and methods of the personnel's ideological-political education which have given a good account of themselves." Here "special attention must be paid to the study of the new situation which is taking shape in the country, party, and Army, and to the consistent and effective solution of new problems. The consolidation and improvement of party building in the Army is a long-term task," the newspaper stresses, "and constant attention must be paid to it."

Near East & South Asia

Status of Middle East Conference Assessed

LD262300 Moscow TASS in English 1905 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—TASS Political News Analyst Boris Shabayev writes:

The Persian Gulf situation that has aggravated to the utmost might go out of control anytime. The hostilities directly affected another Gulf country, Kuwait. The United States actually becomes a participant in the military actions. Unless this escalation is arrested, it might lead to unpredictable consequences and bury much of the process of the normalisation of international situation that has started.

Unless a simplistic view of this process is taken, it is not at all exhausted by relations between the USSR and the USA. The Middle East settlement the advance to which has also been started of late is an inalienable part of this process. An evidence of this is the fact that the permanent members of the United Nations Security Council and the absolute majority of the countries of the Middle East region go along with the idea of holding an international conference on the Middle East. And far from all accepted at once the constructive contents of this idea when it was advanced.

Many people in the Arab East now ponder on the question if the events in the Persian Gulf might not blast the chances of holding the conference. Hardly anyone will deny the obvious truth that the Persian Gulf situation, the Iran-Iraq war have the most negative effect on the overall state of affairs in the region, complicate the process of the Middle East settlement, which is difficult as it is. As obvious is another truth, that any escalation of the conflict is fraught with the aggravation of differences among Arab countries which plays into the hands of those who would like to frustrate a Middle East settlement.

The Soviet Union condemns any actions that run counter to the U.N. Security Council's Resolution 598 and the mission of the United Nations secretary general. Instead of the impermissible concentration of naval

forces and aviation of the United States and a number of other countries in the Persian Gulf, the Soviet Union proposed the setting in motion of the mechanism of the Security Council envisaged by the United Nations Charter. This would be a step on the right track: toward the ensurance of the freedom of shipping in the Gulf and the implementation of the above-mentioned resolution, and, consequently, to the intensification of the process of the Middle East settlement.

U.S. Cruise-Armed Nuclear Subs in Gulf

PM261611 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Oct 87 Second Edition p 6

[TASS report: "Nuclear-Powered Submarines Sent to Crisis Zone"]

[Text] New York, 25 Oct—The United States has sent nuclear-powered submarines carrying cruise missiles equipped with nonnuclear warheads to the Persian Gulf. They can be used to launch strikes against military installations on land, *The New York Times* reports today, citing Pentagon spokesmen.

Two groups of missile-carrying submarines are now in the Arabian Sea, where they are carrying out patrol duty in case, as the newspaper notes, "President Reagan orders a new strike against an Iranian installation on the coast or in the heart of that country's territory." The U.S. naval forces have thus begun a new stage of stepping up their power in the Persian Gulf region, a possibility stated by Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger when addressing the U.S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently.

Vorontsov Interviewed on Ties With Egypt

JN260820 Cairo AL-MUSAWWAR in Arabic 23 Oct 87 pp 26-29

[Interview with First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov by Sana' al-Sa'id in Cairo; date not given]

[Text] [Al-Sa'id] With regard to Egyptian-Soviet relations, what did you sense during your latest visit to Egypt? Are there still reservations on the part of Egyptian officials? Is there any caution, doubt, or suspicion toward the Soviet Union and its policy?

[Vorontsov] There are no reservations, doubts, caution, or suspicion. I did not sense any reservations with regard to Egyptian-Soviet relations. On the contrary, the two sides are very anxious to develop relations. We held amicable consultations, as two friendly countries, in an atmosphere of understanding, trust, and frankness. During my talks with President Husni Mubarak, we recalled the past and the years when there was nothing marring our relations and when we stood side by side in our joint struggle. We agreed the present is full of opportunities to develop our relations. Such development will depend on a good past and a future bright with friendship and amity.

[Al-Sa'id] With regard to Arab-Soviet relations and in light of your recent Gulf tour, are you prepared to take the risk and seek to establish a new working relationship to regain your role as an arbiter in the Middle East and counter the U.S. presence, particularly as you have now succeeded in establishing relations with Oman and the UAE?

[Vorontsov] Your question smacks of a desire to run after and seek influence, and we do not seek that. We do not want to compete with the United States for spheres of influence. However, we have friends in the Arab world whom we help in various fields, including political and diplomatic fields. We join them in thinking of ways to resolve the Middle East question and its ramifications so as to bring about a lasting peace and ways to defuse confrontation in the region. Our interest basically lies in establishing peace throughout the region, not in monopolizing influence over it.

[Al-Sa'id] However, there are those in the region who fear that Soviet plans include establishing a security belt from Afghanistan to the Arabian Gulf, particularly as such a belt does exist in Bab el-Mandeb and several African states. They fear that the Soviet Union wants to have a share in dominating the waterways and shipping lanes that govern the flow of oil and energy and international trade, as that will enable the Soviet Union to impose its will and achieve its objective once the opportunity to share the spheres of influence arises.

[Vorontsov] Such an argument has nothing to do with the Soviet Union at all. As I have said, the Soviet Union does not seek to gain spheres of influence or create security belts. What you have mentioned about Soviet dreams of spheres of influence are merely illusions and unjustifiable misgivings. Do not forget that I am responsible for Gulf, Afghanistan, and Middle East affairs and if there are any Soviet plans, they will be my own plans.

The misgivings which some people have toward the Soviet Union are mere fantasies and illusions. We cannot embark on such foolishness to win control and influence.

[Al-Sa'id] Detente will continue to be fragile in light of the struggle for influence between the two superpowers. This struggle has shown that the United States always insists on refusing to legitimize any Soviet role in any region, especially in the Gulf.

[Vorontsov] This is not only confined to the Gulf but to all other regions. The United States wants to control the destiny of nations. Thus, the United States regards any improvement in relations between us and Latin America as dangerous and assails this improvement. The United States regards Latin America as its garden and orchard. However, we view Latin America as countries and nations.

[Al-Sa'id] Gorbachev's article entitled "The Reality of Secure Peace and Its Guarantees" came to demonstrate a new policy of the Soviets' good intentions and is an idealist document for coexistence in a world devoid of nuclear weapons. Is it possible to reach agreement in the first half of next year to reduce offensive weapons by 50%?

[Vorontsov] Your reference to Gorbachev's article in this regard is a good one. As far as I am concerned, I saw in this article a call to other countries' leaders, urging them to adopt a new open view of international relations in harmony with the eighties. Our view of international relations should take into consideration the crises and problems of today's world and how to overcome them. We cannot build international relations based on theories of the fifties, when the world was different. The role today is different, following liberation from colonialism and in view of the grave danger posed by nuclear weapons. A simple comparison will show us the difference. The number of nuclear warheads in the early fifties did not exceed 200, but today the United States has 40,000 nuclear warheads and the USSR has a similar number. Therefore, 80,000 nuclear warheads do not constitute a security factor but a grave danger to these two countries and the world at large. This number of nuclear weapons can destroy the world. Therefore, we had to adopt a new view. We are about to reach agreement on medium and short-range missiles. This agreement would provide us with unique possibilities for achieving a 50% reduction of strategic arms. As an official heading the Soviet delegation to the Geneva arms talks, I would like to point out that medium-range missiles face many problems because we cannot destroy nuclear missiles and warheads. We are currently discussing with the Americans how to destroy these warheads. If we achieve this, then we will be able to achieve a 50% strategic arms reduction. However, achieving this will depend on whether we maintain the 1972 counterdefense agreement. If we reach agreement with the Americans on this, we will be able to achieve a 50% reduction. However, if the Americans violate this agreement and coninue with the Star Wars program, we will not achieve anything.

[Al-Sa'id] But the United States insists on continuing with the Star Wars initiative, or the so-called Strategic Defense Initiative.

[Vorontsov] We believe that progress is possible in light of the Geneva negotiations. I might be revealing a big secret to *Al-Musawwar* when I say that the two delegations have actually arrived at a common text of a draft agreement to reduce strategic arms by 50%. This is major progress. It is true that there are pending issues within this framework. However, it is sufficient that we are both working according to a common text through which we can agree on many clauses at a later stage.

[Al-Sa'id] Does this mean actual progress has been made so that the Shultz-Shevardnadze meeting in Moscow will result in agreement on an agenda for a U.S.-USSR summit?

[Vorontsov] I hope so. However, there is no need to talk about actual progress. It is enough that we have in our hands a single draft on which we can agree. This is the draft which Gorbachev and Reagan can sign in November.

[Al-Sa'id] But Gorbachev still warns that SDI poses an obstacle to the agreement on nuclear arms, and the United States affirms that nothing will prevent its outer space defense plans. Wouldn't this situation continue the deadlock in strategic arms talks?

[Vorontsov] The danger exists. However, we view the United States as a multi-sided country. There is the U.S. Administration, Congress, the opposition, and the scientific circles that have already agreed with our scientists that SDI would not be effective. These circles have warned against spending millions of dollars on research. Some people could make millions from SDI, but the project itself would not be effective since it is based on an incorrect scientific theory. For our part, we will do all we can to render this system ineffective.

[Al-Sa'id] The West is still cautious in its dealings with you. The best proof of this is Lord Carrington's warning to the West against signing an agreement to eliminate European nuclear defense. There is also his call regarding the need to retain a sufficient quantity of nuclear arms to offset the Warsaw Pact's superiority in conventional and chemical warfare arms.

[Vorontsov] There is great fear in the West that the USSR might succeed in convincing the world public of the need for disarmament. This is indeed strange. In the past, the West spread rumors that the USSR was hostile. Now, however, it fears the USSR's call for disarmament.

I have read rather very strange stories in *The New York Times*. The paper says the real danger lies in the USSR's destruction of all of its missiles. They fear the USSR's proposals on disarmament, although we constantly remind them of the Chernobyl incident. If they have not concluded anything from that incident, we have concluded and learned a great deal from it. The radioactive fallout from Chernobyl constitutes only one third of the fallout from a single nuclear warhead. In other words, the explosion of one nuclear missile will produce three times the Chernobyl fallout.

[Al-Sa'id] The West says there will be no nuclear disarmament until the USSR has reduced its conventional and chemical warfare arms. Are you willing to do this?

[Vorontsov] These are mere excuses and delay tactics. If we had reduced our conventional arms, they would have said we also have hand weapons. The West's aim is to retain the nuclear warheads, and our task is to make it move from one position to another. We must not spare any effort. We agreed on nuclear conrtrol, but the United States refused to stop nuclear tests. We offered to reduce medium-range and tactical missiles, but Europe refused.

Everything the West proposes are strange justifications which cannot be understood. The West cannot turn down a proposal to destroy all Soviet missiles on the justification of retaining U.S. missiles. The West which warned against SS-20 missiles some time ago is now against the removal of these missiles. What a contradiction. But we will not give up. We are now proposing a treaty for the removal of all chemical warfare weapons, but the West has abandoned its earlier position for the sake of retaining the nuclear missiles.

[Al-Sa'id] But are your willing to reduce traditional weapons?

[Vorontsov] We have a proposal to dismantle traditional weapons. The Warsaw Pact submitted this proposal on the decisive and fundamental reduction of weapons and armies in the East and West. During the talks on reduction, we expressed from the start our willingness to reduce tanks and everything else. We said: Let us sit down at the negotiations table and talk. Today, more than 1 year later, we do not see this table. I ask: What formula were they seeking? We are not the ones procrastinating on this matter; the West refuses to reduce tactical missiles and number of aircraft carriers that shadow ships. This is the formula they seek, making conditions on what applies and does not apply in arms reduction. Although the West confines the negotiations to NATO and Warsaw Pact countries, we call for including all European states, such as Austria and Sweden. We do not want to differentiate but reduce the military line in Europe. The Americans and British represent the constant rejection front. However, our proposals represent a peaceful attack on their defensive stands. The West frequently says the Soviet bear is preparing itself for an offensive war against Europe and is ready to attack. However, when we invite them to sit down and discuss their military views and theories, they refuse, claiming disinterest and indifference.

[Al-Sa'id] There were fears that the two superpowers' agreement to reduce medium- and short-range missiles would contain a secret agreement through which the Soviets would make concessions to the Americans regarding regional issues.

[Vorontsov] This is strange and preposterous. We could not possibly be involved in it. We can never make concessions on any regional issue in the area just to reach an agreement in arms limitation. When we discuss the Middle East, we separate it from disarmament. We do not mix the cards or bargain on one issue at the expense of another.

[Al-Sa'id] Does this mean the Moscow summit between Shevardnadze and Shultz may crystallize many regional issues, foremost of which are the Gulf war and the Arab-Israeli conflict, especially since the region's states essentially want the Middle East issue to be on the agenda?

[Vorontsov] We agreed in Washington that the Moscow meeting should deal with these issues. That is why Shultz visited the region before the Moscow summit. Thus, the region's issues will be discussed and clarified. Our stand is clear, and we have a single policy that we present to Shultz or the region's sides. I hope the United States will adopt a new view of Middle East issues, especially since there are real signs of an international conference. Israel has begun to discuss it as well as the United States, the U.S. Jewish organizations, Western Europe, the EEC, and the Arab countries.

[Al-Sa'id] Does this mean you hope the Israeli offer and U.S. proposal on the international conference are serious, even though their real stands focus on separate negotiations?

[Vorontsov] Our stand is clear: Direct negotiations will not lead to any result. They tried holding separate talks with Jordan and failed. There is no future for separate negotiations. We support negotiations between the region's countries within the framework of an international conference. We support a principal issue—the Palestinian people's right to self-determination. Therefore, we believe that convening an active and effective interntional conference, not as a front or umbrella, is the all important issue and aim. We believe all of the concerned sides, including the PLO, should participate in this conference.

[Al-Sa'id] Are you still perturbed by the fact that Western military buildup in the Gulf has undermined security and that U.S. military presence in particular has foiled UN diplomatic efforts?

[Vorontsov] Yes, we are very much perturbed. The heavy U.S. military buildup has only caused concern. We would like this situation to be resolved through a collective effort within the framework of the United Nations and participation of the permanent member states of the Security Council. We must implement Resolution 598 in a way that makes anyone who opposes suspension of war look as if he is opposing the whole world. Individual initiatives, such as the one carried out by the United States, are wrong. We were surprised when the United States took unilateral action. This is a very serious matter, and it is also useless. It is serious for the United States itself. The only action that can be taken against the war is joint action, within the famework of the United Nations. By acting unilaterally in the Gulf, the United States has created a confrontation with Iran that could develop into a fierce war. It would have been better if the United States had acted through the United Nations. That would have created a better impression, as far as the Iranians were concerned. They would not have considered it as a provocation. By its military buildup, the United States has given Iran the excuse to reject Resolution 598. The United States has not succeeded. All the United States wanted was to appear as a powerful nation before the Arab states. But this is useless. We do not want showmanship but an end to the Gulf war.

[Al-Sa'id] The United States has monopolized the role of a superpower guranteeing protection for small states. Why has the USSR refrained from providing similar protection and thus has failed to achieve a balance of power in a region of such strategic importance as the Gulf?

[Vorontsov] We do not want, or like, to assume theatrical roles in the international arena. We have proposed a practical move. The requirement is to back Resolution 598 with certain specific moves. We proposedformation of a UN force which will be more effective than theatrical moves.

[Al-Sa'id] This means that you are still calling for formation of a UN force to safeguard freedom of navigation in the Gulf, despite Western claims about the difficulty of carrying out such an idea because it is impractical and very complicated?

[Vorontsov] On the contrary, it will be more effective than their unilateral moves. Even if we take into consideration the hotheads in Iran ready today to fight the United States, they will never fight the UN force. I also do not think that implementation of this idea will be a complicated affair. The idea is simple, if there is a will to implement it. As for the USSR's participation in this idea, we are ready take part, as long as it is a collective international move and not a unilateral move.

[Al-Sa'id] It is being alleged that Moscow is trying to exploit the Gulf situation to rebuild its relations with Iran. The indications are clear: Flights have been resumed, an agreement has been reached to establish a shipping line between the Soviet port of Baku and two Iranian ports, and Soviet experts have returned to work on Iranian industrial projects.

[Vorontsov] With regard to experts, there have always Soviet experts in Iran. However, some years ago the Iranians proposed reducing the number of these experts. What happened recently is that the number of experts was restored to what it used to be. There are no more than the 200 experts at the Esfahan iron and steel complex.

Flights have in fact been restored, but we do not attach great importance to such a step. The Iranians took an inappropriate step when they suspended such flights 2 years ago. Even with restoration of flights, there will be no more than one flight per week. Work at the port has been continuing without interruption, and there is only one ship that makes regular trips. As for the oil pipeline and what the Iranians frequently say about their plans for transporting natural gas and oil through the Soviet Union, the old natural gas pipelines have become dilapidated through lack of use.

Second, at present we do not need Iranian natural gas. With regard to the oil, the Iranians talk a lot about a pipeline across the Black Sea. It cannot be built at present. It requires a 5-year plan. It is also costly, and Iran has no funds to pay toward its construction. Such a project may be possible in the distant future. I say all this in response to illusions spread by the West, for reality is much simpler than such claims and allegations.

[Al-Sa'id] Is there any truth to rumors that there is some coolness in your present relations with Iraq?

[Vorontsov] There are no doubts with regard to the real friends of the Soviet Union. There is coolness only in relations with those who are cool toward the Soviet Union. We take pride in Iraq's friendship. The Iraqis realize that they can rely on the Soviet Union, which does not let its friends down and does not abandon them at times of crisis. We are committed to the treaty of friendship and cooperation with Iraq, despite Iran's criticism of it. Our reply to Iran is that we never abandon our friends, whether Iran likes it or not. There is no coolness in relations with Iraq. They know our stand well, and we consult with them on various aspects of the war. I have visited Iraq several times and we held talks with President Saddam and with Foreign Minister Tariq 'Aziz. Our talks were always friendly and warm.

[Al- Sa'id] In light of reports that the Soviet stand on Israel has not yet crystallized, is it true that Israel has rejected a Soviet offer to establish relations on the level of interest sections such as those which Hungary and Poland maintain, and that Israel is demanding full diplomatic relations?

[Vorontsov] First I should say there was no Soviet offer to Israel. It is true that Israel insists on restoring full diplomatic relations and exchanging ambassadors, and rejects all other formulas. However, the Soviet Union has not made any offer to it. Our stand is firm, and we still say that establishment of diplomatic relations with Israel depends on its stand on settling the Middle East problem.

The exaggerated claims made by Israel followed the talks held by a 4-member Soviet consular delegation 3 months ago. The task of that delegation was very critical, for it dealt with the rights of Soviet citizens living there. The delegation's mission was connected with ownership of land and property that Israel is trying to seize. The consular delegation, together with lawyers, is seeking to establish the ownership of Soviet nationals of these lands. The consular delegation will return to the Soviet Union once its task is completed.

[Al-Sa'id] Do nuclear weapons and Israel's nuclear ambitions, most recently the Jericho-2, not pose a danger to the region?

[Vorontsov] Undoubtedly. Israel's nuclear ambitions constitute a grave danger. We are loudly publicizing this to expose these increasing ambitions. The Vanunu case is clear proof of these ambitions. Vanunu said significant things on this matter, and that is why they kidnapped

him from London. Israel should realize the Chernobyl lesson. It should realize that if tries to use these nuclear weapons against its Arab neighbors, it will destroy itself before anyone else. This is a dangerous toy and not a gun that you fire across the border.

[Al-Sa'id] Can we say that we have entered a new phase in East-West relations? Is it possible to lay down the foundation of a code of trust between the two sides in light of new developments?

[Vorontsov] This is what we want and seek to achieve. However, this trust should be reinforced. Thus, we agreed to the Americans' request to allow their observers to attend our military maneuvers, in accordance with the Stockholm Agreement. They also visited the Krasnopark radar station which they regarded as a secret site.

[Al-Sa'id] Does this not constitute a concession?

[Vorontsov] I do not wish to call it a concession because even if it was, and it was not, in fact it was a concession to reason and logic and to efforts that are being exerted to reinforce trust. It was not a concession to the United States.

[Al-Sa'id] What about Afghanistan today? Is there any retreat or delay in your intention to withdraw from there?

[Vorontsov] What is happening in Afghanistan does not concern anyone in the West. This is the truth. The Americans propagate and repeat the words of rebel gangs in Peshawar, and they are their only source. As far as the withdrawal is concerned, yes, we will withdraw in accordance with our declaration during the 27th Communist Party Congress. We do not make statements just for the sake of making them. The withdrawal is not a problem, and we will leave just as we entered. However, the problem is what will happen in Afghanistan after that. Therefore, when we speak about withdrawing, we speak from a political standpoint, or in relation to what will happen when we withdraw. The real war between the government in Kabul and the rebel gangs will begin then. We do not want to see any bloodshed in Afghanistan. Therefore, before we leave we want a collective coalition government to be established there so that the two sides may conduct a dialogue, hold negotiations, and bear the responsibility of Afghanistan. This is what must take place in the first place. They should reach agreement on the destiny of their country. Then we will immediately withdraw, and they will decide on their self-determination. Najibullah and his government have agreed to abandon their exclusive rule and accept government coalition. Those who pretend to be heroes, the Mujahidin leaders who love in Pakistan, should settle their affairs and return to hold a dialogue with the Najibullah government. No one knows if they want to return home, At any rate, those who wish to return should do so and bear the responsibility.

Kapitsa Received by Egyptian Officials

PM261649 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 25 Oct 87 Morning Edition p 4

[TASS report under the "Official Reports" rubric]

[Text] M.S. Kapitsa, chairman of the Soviet Committee for Solidarity With the Countries of Asia and Africa, who is in Cairo, was received by R. al-Mahjub, speaker of the Egyptian People's Assembly, and also by E. 'Abd al-Majid, minister of foreign affairs. In the course of the conversations, the marked galvanization of Soviet-Egyptian ties in various spheres, including between the two countries' social organizations, was pointed out.

Anniversary of Aswan High Dam Noted

PM261204 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 23 Oct 87 Morning Edition p 5

[Own correspondent D. Velikiy "Reportage From the Scene of Events": "Aswan Energy"]

[Text] Cairo, Aswan—In olden times, Aswan was called the master of the Nile, because it was located on the current of the mighty river where its first rapids partly "regulated" the flow of the waters. The high dam, built by thousands of Egyptian and Soviet specialists and workers, gave Aswan real power over the water and made it the zealous guardian of the river for the whole country—from the Nubian Desert to the Mediterranean.

It has been 20 years since the first turbines of the power stations were commissioned. To this day, the brand name of Leningrad Elektrosila association stands out on them.

"By all appearances, they won't wear out for several more decades," Mustafa al-Genedi [as published], director of the Aswan power station, claims.

We are standing in a vast, light pavilion at the entrance to the dam's many stages, by a mockup of a turbine.

"In 20 years," my interlocutor goes on, "only trivial items have been replaced: a few wires and small components. The parts most subject to wear—the wheels—were replaced with American ones. In all this time, the station has generated 115 billion kilowatt-hours of electricity."

The electricity produced by the power station remains a very high proportion of the total volume of electricity produced in the country. However, it is steadily falling: from 37% in 1982 to 19.5% last year.

"That is only natural," A. Khasaneyn [as published], deputy manager of the Aswan hydroengineering complex, says, commenting on these figures, "because the dam's energy called into being many sectors of industry in Egypt, and they, in turn, made it possible to build a large number of thermal power stations."

"In November 1981, there was an earthquake here, quite a substantial one. How did the dam behave at this critical moment?"

"Impeccably," M.R. Shakhir [as published], director of the dam administration, replies. "After the earthquake thorough investigations were carried out. The dam was as good as new. It is still as good as new," he adds, casting a glance at it. "Its life was calculated at 30 billion cubic meters of water, and not even 1 billion has gone through yet. So you can see how much capacity there is..."

"We believe," Mustafa al-Genedi adds, "that the constructive, creative spirit of the Aswan project must be revived, and we have begun discussing with the Soviet side the possibility of new Egyptian-Soviet projects..."

Government Delegation Leaves for Damascus

LD261235 Moscow TASS in English 1224 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—A Soviet governmental delegation has left Moscow for Damascus today at the invitation of the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic. It is led by Minister of Land Reclamation and Water Management of the USSR Nikolay Vasiliyev.

The delegation will attend the celebrations on the occasion of the 30th anniversary of the signing of the Soviet-Syrian agreement on economic and technical cooperation.

Soviet Official on U.S. Attack on Iran

JN250723 Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD AL-USBU'I in Arabic 22 Oct 87 p 8

[Text] Moscow—Aleksandr Ivanov-Galitsyn, chief of the Persian Gulf and Jordan Section at the USSR Foreign Ministry's Near Eastern and North African Countries Administration, has told *Al-Ittihad* that the U.S. raids on the Iranian oil platforms show the U.S. nonabidance by international Resolution No 598, something which has contributed to a feverish escalation of the Iraq-Iran war.

The Soviet official reiterated that the only solution for the prevalence of peace in the Gulf region is formation of UN naval emergency forces in which nonaligned countries which have nothing to do with the Gulf conflict will participate and whose duties will be to safeguard the safety of navigation for all commercial vessels in the Gulf.

Najibullah Message on UN Day Cited

LD242238 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 24 Oct 87

[Text] Kabul October 24 TASS—The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) expresses commitment to the lofty purposes of the United Nations Charter and for its part exerts all necessary efforts to achieve them, says a message sent by Najibullah, general secretary of the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan Central Committee, chairman of the DRA Revolutionary Council, to U.N. Secretary-General Javier Perez de Cuellar on the occasion of the United Nations Day observed today.

The document emphasizes that Afghanistan invariably advocates an end to the arms race and favours universal disarmement, the establishment of a system of comprehensive security and a new just international economic and information order, opposed racism, apartheid, colonialism and neo-colonialism. These are exactly the tasks before the United Nations Organisation, the most authoritative international organisation uniting over 159 states.

The document notes an important role of the United Nations Organisation in solving regional conflicts and, in part, in settling the situation around Afghanistan. The peacemaking activity by representatives of the United Nations Organisation at the time when imperialist countries resort to various manoeuvres to intensify the undeclared war constitutes an outstanding contribution to a political solution of problems, the message by Najibullah points out.

The national reconciliation policy now enacted in the DRA is a step towards halting bloodshed in Afghanistan and removing tension in the region, a step that corresponds entirely to the United Nations' humane goals, the document emphasizes.

Success of DRA Conciliation Drive Assessed

PM231102 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 14 Oct 87 p 14

[Kim Selikhov article under the "Writer's Notebook" rubric: "Afghanistan: Along a Difficult Path"—first paragraph is LITERATURNAYA GAZETA introduction; boldface passages as published]

[Text] A policy of national reconciliation was proclaimed in Afghanistan as from 15 January of this year. The government and the PDPA called for an end to the fratricidal war. How is the process of national reconciliation progressing? Who is supporting it, and who is opposing it?

Kabul-Moscow — I have visited Afghanistan on several occasions over the last few years. Once again, I had a new encounter with the ancient land, with hot and dusty Kabul. I thought I was quite familiar with its avenues and winding small streets, its cultural monuments and noisy bazaars, its people's customs and character. But I was to make new discoveries. The city is crowded; the faces of Kabul's residents are more cheerful. The Garden of Babur, deserted and dangerous for strollers in the past, where 2 years ago one ran the risk of coming under fire from bandits shooting from the hilltops, is now full of people. Families flock here to relax at the end of the

workweek, to hear music performed by their favorite singers, and to share a family picnic. Until quite recently, Kabul's streets were deserted after sundown. The nights were uneasy, echoing with shots and loud authoritative commands: "Dirsh!"—"Halt!" Explosions can still be heard at times, but the city is much quieter than before. The curfew has been lifted, and many stalls and tea rooms are open until late.

The Soviet writers' meetings with workers and students, Army and Sarandoy (militia) servicemen, ulemas and mullahs, and the intelligentsia were more frank and spontaneous. The Festival of Soviet Literature in Afghanistan devoted to the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution was rather unusual this year. There was no more ostentation, no more polite diplomatic speeches. We were virtually showered with questions about restructuring following the 27th CPSU Congress. The televised press conference by the delegation of Soviet writers itself lasted 3 hours and was later broadcast in full throughout the country.

We learned much about the changes that have occurred in Afghan society since proclamation of the policy of national reconciliation by the government and the PDPA. It was inaugurated on 15 January this year, to coincide with the unilateral cease-fire and announcement of the truce. I remember the words spoken by Najibullah, general secretary of the PDPA Central Committee, in his address on Kabul radio: "I want to address you, fellow human being, to address you, brother Afghan, to address you, peasant! What has the war brought you? Poverty, extortions, threats, and intimidations. Shots in the night. Think and answer the main question: Do you want war?"

I also remember: "I address the Afghans, each and every Afghan family: What has the war brought you? Ruined homes. Wandering in search of shelter. Think, people, and answer the main question: Do you want war? We are offering peace!"

Only a short time has passed since then, but now there is not a single Afghan family that would not respond to the party's impassioned call. This historic process of ending the long fratricidal war is progressing slowly, with great difficulties, but it is progressing and gathering pace. Each day there are reports of dushmans in their hundreds and thousands accepting the truce or agreeing to cooperate with the people's power, thousands of villages have been liberated from the bandits by peaceful means, and lines of refugees are making their way back home.

During the war years, enemy propaganda expended much money and effort to discredit the people's power in Afghanistan in the eyes of the world public, claiming that Afghans—not in their thousands but in their millions—were abandoning their native places and fleeing abroad as though from the plague. Indeed, a significant proportion of the population is still abroad, mainly in Pakistan and Iran. Many of them were living in these countries long before the April Revolution, having left the motherland in quest of wages and bread for their hungry families. Thus, according to the old statistics under the monarchy, about 3 million Afghans were employed doing the dirtiest and hardest jobs in Pakistan and Iran, and the counterrevolution blocked all the ways home for them in the very first days of the war. The refugee figures also include 1.5 million nomads who, regardless of the war, drive their flocks of sheep from the border pastures to the north in springtime and return again to their customary sites in winter. Of course, thousands of landowners, officials under the king and Daud, policemen, officers from the old army, quite a few representatives of the intelligentsia, and figures in science and culture have fled Afghanistan since the victory of the revolution. Under the influence of enemy propaganda, ordinary illiterate peasants, craftsmen, and traders have also fled abroad to escape the "rule of the infidels." The hunger and poverty abroad, coupled with threats and tempting bounties for every head of a killed patriot, brought these deceived people beneath the banner of the counterrevolution. For example, some dushman gangs pay 15,000 afghanis for the killing of a people's army soldier, and between 30,000 and 100,000 afghanis for an officer, depending on rank. Prices are correspondingly doubled for every Soviet serviceman killed. A helicopter or an aircraft shot down is worth 1 million afghanis. The money is spent as they like. Matters have gone so far—I learned this during my last trip—that women are now on sale in dushman camps for consolation and warmth in the cold tents and caves; they are sold by weight, like firewood. The dushmans levy taxes on many villages in the combat operations zone and threaten parents with death unless they let their children join the gangs. To intimidate the disobedient, they organize public executions, tear out tongues, cut off ears and noses, gouge out eyes, and hack at the soft parts of their victims' bodies.

It is, of course, impossible to entertain delusions following the initial successes of the national reconciliation policy. The people are split. Tribes are split. Families are split. I have heard my compatriots, both in Moscow and in Kabul, say on many occasions: Many Afghans are insincere; they cannot be trusted; they think one thing and say something else. I am convinced that this shows an unwillingness to perceive the situation's complexity. I know from my own experience how difficult it is to engage our Afghan friends—even friends—in a frank conversation. I met a woman whose family consists of 475 persons spread over 4 generations. She herself and her own 20 brothers and sisters have between 5 and 10 children each. Almost one-half of this huge family is "on the other side." The majority of families in Afghanistan are like this. This woman is wholeheartedly for reconciliation, but you could hardly convince her to say so in public. Civic courage is needed to cooperate with the authorities or to speak out in support of them in the press, on radio, or on television—after all, this could cost you your life. But heroes are always fewer in number than ordinary people with their weaknesses, fears, and constant worry: "How will things work out?..."

The party strives to work with all groups, strata, groupings, and clans, no matter how divergent their interests may be, no matter how acute the internecine strife may be, no matter how deep the insults may reach. National reconciliation cannot be achieved without such patient and painstaking political work.

Some people perceived the party's decision as a sign of weakness, a retreat from the principles of the April Revolution. Comrade Najibullah emphasized in conversation with the Soviet writers that realism is not weakness. The people's power now has at its disposal everything it needs to continue the war against the counterrevolution: "We do not want to threaten anyone, but we remind people: Never before has a single Afghan Government had larger or better equipped Armed Forces. No one has ever had such loyal and powerful friends."

The policy of national reconciliation has brought about amendments in the PDPA's internal party life. It demands of its members the art of political work in the thick of the people, so that, in a future multiparty system, the PDPA can become the authoritative party of the masses. Time also demands changes in the style and methods of party leadership. The Central Committee sets an example of close contacts with the working people. Nowadays the workplaces for Politburo and Central Committee members are plant shops and villages, university lecture halls and servicemen's units. They have to spend 20 out of every 30 working days in the provinces. Some leaders have been permanently posted to work in the places where they were born and grew up, where they are known and respected. Najibullah himself, disregarding the dangers, constantly meets the people in the country's most outlying regions. He also finds time to deliver speeches at authoritative forums and to converse with workers and peasants, servicemen and clerics, families of the deceased and schoolchildren. He is distinguished by his ability to listen to people, not to impose his own opinion or make hasty and unconsidered decisions, to be self-critical and demanding first toward himself and only afterwards toward others. He is a physician by profession, a graduate of Kabul University's Faculty of Medicine. His work now is not to heal the sick but to save his motherland from the most terrible of diseases—the plague of war.

The PDPA Central Committee's new style of work is having an effect on primary party organizations. General questions far removed from the life of the collective and the needs and concerns of ordinary people have disappeared from the meetings' agendas. People openly speak of shortcomings in the work of the Central Committee, ministries, and departments. Here are just a few of the thousands of questions asked of PDPA Central Committee members by different audiences: Many workers' and peasants' sons have died defending the revolution, but can you name one top leader who has lost a son in this war? Some party members wallow in debauchery, consume alcoholic beverages, take bribes, and implant bureaucratism. Why are harsh measures not applied against them? Party and ministry officials abuse their official position, many party members do not work as revolutionaries should. Why does the allocation of state apartments in Kabul and other cities take place in breach of the law? Why are individual citizens who own their homes also allocated state apartments? Why are land parcels distributed among acquaintances? The families of those who have died for the revolution and war veterans primarily suffer from this."

Preparation is now under way for the second all-Afghan party conference. It will sum up the experience of work on national reconciliation and will make amendments to the program and statutes. There will be a special discussion on party unity and on overcoming factionalism and tribalism. Enmity between the two factions—the "Khalq" and the "Parcham"—was a real disaster in years past. New groups have also emerged now and they are not always inclined toward joint purposeful work.

Will the party succeed in carrying the policy of national reconciliation through to a victorious conclusion? The PDPA answers this question today by specific deeds: unilateral proclamation of a cease-fire, amnesty for detainees, decrees on return of repatriates' property, waiver of tax liability, and guaranteed work for all who return home from abroad. The decree regulating land and water relations and increasing maximum private land holding from 5-30 to 100 jeribs (1 jerib is 0.2 hectares) was a major event in the life of the peasantry. The state is expanding the economic and legal base for long-term mutually advantageous cooperation with the private sector. An Islamic Center for Scientific Research and Teacher Training has been set up for the first time in the country's history. The state has taken over the cost of maintaining the Kabul University Faculty of Theology and 20 madrasah institutions. A law has been passed legalizing parties, and the draft constitution and other documents have been published.

But the national reconciliation policy is by no means the same as peace. Imperialist forces have an interest in continuing the fratricidal war. The United States and its allies have supplied various anti-Afghan armed groupings with a total of 4 billion dollars. The U.S. Government is involving Pakistan, on whose territory the Afghan counterrevolution is based, further and further in its aggressive policy. A considerable number of gangs, directed and supplied with arms from Pakistan at U.S. expense, continue active combat operations instead of taking reciprocal peace steps. Counterrevolutionary forces have launched a war in the air against transport aircraft and helicopters, and the victims of this war are often civilians. There are frequent mine explosions and acts of sabotage in Kabul itself.

Our own sons, courageous internationalist servicemen, participate in repelling imperialist aggression together with the Afghan soldiers.

I would like to describe an unforgettable encounter with our soldiers and officers.

The sun had hardly risen above the rocky mountain peaks, and the loud voices of the muezzin echoed from the towers of numerous mosques, waking up sleepy Kabul and calling the faithful to traditional morning worship. On that morning, Valeriy Povolyayev and I climbed on a BMP infantry combat vehicle to visit our guys manning isolated outposts in the mountains, right at the front line, where battles are still waged and blood still shed. Soon our vehicle left the smooth asphalt highway and took a country track full of potholes, steep ridges, and clouds of soft, choking dust. A narrow-shouldered guy, an automatic rifle held between his feet, sat next to me on the armor plate. I took out a packet of cigarettes, offered one to my neighbor.

"'Yava...' I've forgotten what they taste like. We only get one brand—'Pamir'... They're on the strong side, they keep you awake. Do you want to try one?"

We started talking. It transpired that Private First Class Valentin Lebedev and I are neighbors—he comes from Babushkinskiy Rayon. After graduating from technical college, he worked in a plant.

"The 2 years of service in Afghanistan have flashed by like a single day. I'll soon be home. I recently had a letter from the shop chief. He wrote that a new machine tool is waiting for me. As for Mom and Dad, they're counting the days; they're excited.

"You ask whether it was necessary for us to come here? That's a question of big politics. I personally am convinced that, had it not been for the Soviet soldiers, the land here would have been swimming in blood."

Suddenly the armored personnel carrier braked sharply, just before the next ridge. Lieutenant Colonel Sergey Ivanov, 35-year-old Siberian and regimental deputy commander for political affairs, who was seated in front, gave the order:

"Go ahead, sappers!"

My neighbor and his friend Nikolay Ivanchenkov, wiry and taciturn, jumped off the vehicle.

"What's happened?" we asked worriedly.

"We've lost the tracks of the vehicle from the outpost, which traveled the same route earlier. The road is rather too smooth... We must check, in case it was smoothed over by dushman hands after laying mines," the lieutenant colonel explained. "Now the guys will go through with their probes and find the lost tracks—and we'll move on. They're used to this, skilled masters..."

The made their way carefully. I looked at my watch, staring at the second hand patiently marking the passage of time, the time taken by this game with death. Their sweat-covered backs moved further and further away. Then Valentin signaled with his hand, and the silence was broken by a mischievous boy's whistle.

"All in order, no mines, the sappers have reached the BMP's fresh tracks," Lt Col Ivanov said and, leaning over the open hatch, ordered: "Let's go!"

Let me tell you, being seated on top of the hot armor is not comfortable. You are shaken, and you feel that you might fly off the combat vehicle at any moment. I automatically reached out and got a firm hold of the large-caliber machine gun's stubby barrel. The engine roared, but the vehicle did not roll along the track. It crawled, like a tortoise.

"There's the outpost," the lieutenant colonel said, pointing to one of the mountain peaks. "Do you see that dot coming down the slope? That's outpost commander Artur Kramerov. He looks frail, not too tall, but he's a proper eagle in reality, a combat officer recently awarded the 'For Valor' Medal."

Finally he stood before us, commander of a Soviet outpost in the Afghan mountains. After reporting to the deputy commander for political affairs, Artur took us around to show us his unpretentious domain: a sports ground, camouflaged guns, a tiny building housing the Lenin Room and the dining room, unprepossessing barracks built of stones, with plank-clad walls inside. The entire night shift was fast asleep in a row on the wooden planking. Guns rumbled nearby, carrying out their daily ranging fire, but none of the guys even moved—they're used to it.

"It's more or less quiet here in daytime," the commander told us. "But as soon as the sun goes down, the dushman devils get up to all sorts of tricks everywhere. Here at the summit, we are like a bone stuck in the bandits' throats. Our guns are targeted on all paths from where a dushman attack or a caravan with weapons may appear. Next to us is an outpost manned by our Afghan friends."

"So there has been no cease-fire, despite the fact that the government has extended the truce?"

"Not around our outpost. But we've learned from newspapers and conversations with residents in the village that many bandit formations have ceased opposing the authorities."

Suddenly, seeing us sweating in the 40-degree sunshine, he became worried and began urging us to get under cover in the small shed, where off-duty soldiers were hurriedly taking bulletproof vests off their bare, sunburned bodies and donning sun-bleached green jackets with snow-white collars in order to make a proper impression on the writers. We sharpened our pens,

opened the notebooks, and bombarded the guys with questions about their military labor and yesterday's rocket and mortar attack on the outpost by the enemy. They shrugged their shoulders in amazement:

"There's nothing unusual in our life. We try to serve properly. Even though it's frightening at times, we do not notice it. We keep a grip on ourselves. We have learned to fight with our brains, without taking unnecessary risks, but without being cowards, either. Here, at this outpost, we're defending our motherland."

I listened to the guys' laconic tales and thought to myself that we also have become rather too laconic in saying good things about them. Is this fair? You see, several lucky guys flew from Kabul to Moscow with us. Suntanned, broad-shouldered, in smart paratroopers' uniform with striped vests, orders and medals on their chests, they should have been welcomed with flowers and orchestras. Warm words should have been spoken; humble homage should have been paid to their wartime feats... But there was no music, no bunches of flowers, no Komsomol orators— just the mothers' warm embrace.

For 8 years now, subunits of the Limited Contingent of Soviet Troops in Afghanistan have been participating in the fighting, containing the enemy onslaught together with soldiers of the Afghan Army. They are not only containing it; they are successfully smashing many of the counterrevolution's bandit formations.

In their combat collaboration with the Afghans, our boys are having to engage a stubborn and insidious enemy. The war in Afghanistan is a difficult and brutal war against an adversary well-instructed and well-trained for operations in mountainous and desert terrain. He is an adversary who does battle both in large forces and in small terrorist groups. Before crossing the DRA border, the dushmans undergo appropriate training for a period of 6-18 months in numerous specialized training centers under the leadership of experienced instructors from the United States and other countries. The enemy is equipped with the latest modern weapons, including Stinger and Blowpipe SAM's. These are not "gangs" but a distinctive, mobile, well-paid army which knows how to carry out audacious raids and operations. When repulsed, its groupings promptly fall back to seek sanctuary across the border of neighboring countries, there to regroup, lick their wounds, and remount military operations in Afghanistan.

So our comparatively small troop contingent is having to wage war against an organized and strong foe. During combat operations, Soviet soldiers have displayed not only great courage but also martial skills in complex geographical and climatic conditions, carrying out several brilliant operations to rout major enemy groupings.

The time has come to erect a memorial in Moscow to the Soviet internationalists who have died brave deaths on foreign soil at different times in our history. I believe I will find broad support among our public if from the pages of our newspaper I address the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium with a proposal to inaugurate a special memorial medal for internationalist troops.

Thousands of young people have experienced combat service in Afghanistan during these 8 years. I know many internationalist servicemen who, having served their tour of duty in Afghanistan, volunteer again for frontline service. It is mainly children of workers and peasants who serve here. To my amazement, I rarely encountered any grandchildren or children of writers, cultural figures, or high-ranking leadership officials in the subunits I have visited over the last few years. I believe this is a special topic demanding explanation.

Not only Soviet servicemen but our whole people render invaluable fraternal help to Afghanistan. Each year the flow of freight from the USSR increases, the number of Afghan students trained in Soviet VUZ's and technical colleges is growing, and several union republics have opened boarding schools for Afghan servicemen's children. The free Soviet aid to the DRA's population runs into millions of rubles, ranging from matches, salt, and kerosene to motor vehicles and agricultural equipment. Unfortunately, however, until recently this aid did not always reach the working people. Soviet-made cans containing meat stew or condensed milk can still be seen on sale at market stalls both in Kabul and in the provinces. Footwear and clothing destined for poor people often find their way into the hands of bazaar speculators. It is an even more unpleasant fact that the stalls at times sell Soviet Army vests and all sorts of ammunition.

Now, according to a PDPA Central Committee and government resolution, the free Soviet aid is distributed by Army and Sarandoy subunits in towns and villages under strict monitoring.

A large detachment of Soviet specialists is at work in Afghanistan. Many of them have left good memories. Unfortunately, there are others who fail the difficult examination in internationalism. Soviet ministries and departments and party organs do not always carefully select and train cadres with a view to specific features of the country, its customs, culture, and the people's lifestyle. Sometimes our specialists unthinkingly endeavor to transfer artificially to Afghan soil Soviet experience of labor organization and competition, the training process, and the work of creative organizations. I recall one such zealous comrade, when the Afghanistan Writers Union was being set up, giving advice "to compose songs and write short stories and novellas at an accelerated revolutionary pace." I also came across specialists who, having spent many years in Afghanistan, have found no time to study the local languages, history, and customs and have led an isolated life inside the Soviet colony.

"Of course, there are unworthy people to be found among your advisers," I was told by an Afghan friend. "On the other hand, Afghanistan needs so many of them that it would be difficult to rely only on highly skilled specialists, let alone those who are also familiar with specific Afghan conditions."

My interlocutor was, of course, right to a certain extent. But this does not mean we cannot organize matters better, and not only in regard to selecting advisers. For example, there is still a shortage of phrasebooks to permit communication with Afghanistan's multilingual population. We find ourselves—at times even under extreme circumstances—deaf and dumb. We are not properly helping the Afghan friends in organizing effective propaganda actually at provincial level, among peasants and nomads. We often forget that the mass of Afghans are illiterate, that they must be addressed in forms easy to comprehend, without high-flown and incomprehensible slogans and appeals.

The paratroopers showed me a propaganda booklet captured from the dushmans: colored photographs, the minimum necessary text, and the maximum emotional effect in a spirit of hatred for Soviet people and the Kabul government. I immediately thought of the newspapers published by the authorities, with squalid illustrations and text too complex even for literate Afghans, which speak of everything under the sun except problems really perturbing the Afghans. In my view, there is much more work to be done here.

Our multinational literature still owes a great debt to Soviet internationalist servicemen and the whole people. A few writers are writing about the Soviet soldiers' feats in Afghanistan. They are: Aleksandr Prokhanov, Valeriy Povolyayev, Yuriy Verchenko, Dmitro Pavlychko, Vladimir Karpov, Yulian Semenov, Fazu Aliyeva, Lyudmila Shchipakhina, Feliks Chuyev, Andrey Dementyev, Vyacheslav Shugayev, Lev Shapkin, Aleksey Dmitriyenko, Robert Rozhdestvenskiy, and a few others. Our bookshelves will be, so to speak, stocked up as a result of the latest trip to Afghanistan. Garold Registan, Stanislav Kunyayev, Safar Barnoyev, and Utigen Kunisbayev returned from Kabul with major creative plans.

Time will pass, and our combat regiments will return home from Afghanistan, having performed their international duty. Who but we writers can glorify their feats? Here, in full view of everyone, the quality and staunchness of contemporary Soviet man's character are being tested. Here are the heroes of our future books. They await the writers, calling out and demanding weighty, truthful, elevated, and inspiring words. The internationalist servicemen are waiting for visits to their regiments and battalions and asking by name for their favorite writers—Yevgeniy Yevtushenko, Andrey Voznesenskiy, Chingiz Aytmatov, Rasul Gamzatov, Bulat Okudzhava, and Valentin Rasputin, hoping that they would buy a ticket on Aeroflot's Moscow-Kabul flight and spend at least a day among the soldiers.

"What do you think: Will the famous writers respond to our request?" the guys at the distant mountain outpost asked.

I would like to share the guys' belief that they will.

...Next morning, back at the regimental headquarters, we learned that our outpost fought a battle with the enemy again during the night.

Correspondent Reports Qandahar Situation
LD262145 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Correspondent M. Leshchinskiy report from Qandahar, Afghanistan; from the "Vremya" newscast— recorded]

[Text] Qandahar is a town in southern Afghanistan, on the very edge of the hot Registan desert. It has probably been mentioned more often than other places in recent months in broadcasts by the BBC, the Voice of America Radio Free Europe, and a multitude of other Western radio stations. What cock-and-bull stories have these radio voices not reported! Qandahar is supposedly in the hands of counterrevolution, and not one representative of people's power has been here all these 8 years, not one Soviet or Afghan soldier. But you feel all the naivete, I would call it, of these lies when you are right here in the center of Qandahar.

As you can see, we Soviet journalists are reporting from here, a town which was the first capital of the Afghan state.

We have had occasion to visit this town more than once. Indeed, Qandahar is suffering from the war more than all other towns in the country. There is an explanation for this—not only in present conditions but also historically. There has traditionally been strong opposition here to any central authority, so it is no surprise that in recent years the toughest and biggest armed formations have been built up in Qandahar. Their ringleaders have rejected the very idea of national reconciliation. It would be naive to expect any rapid change in this position or an end to armed terror. For that reason, a purely military course of destroying them is being followed.

But apart from specially trained and well-equipped formations, many other people have frequently found it necessary to take up arms. These taxi drivers are among those whom we, sometimes making too much of a generalization, call bandits. They themselves make no secret of the fact that they oppose the Kabul regime. However, the conversation we had with them concerned peace, in its simplest and original sense. The house of one of them was destroyed, as was the garage of another, and a third one lost his vehicle. People are tired of war; they want calm.

It is for the sake of that, the drivers said, that we are ready to forget all past grievances and losses.

Letters of Soldier Killed in DRA Published

PM261055 [Editorial Report] Moscow *Sovetskaya Kultura* in Russian 15 October 1987 carries on page 6 under the headline "'I Never Hid Behind Backs...'" a feature compiled by V. Matonin, consisting of letters written home by a Soviet serviceman stationed in the DRA and the following editorial introduction:

"Let us read these letters together—letters from Guards Sergeant Yuriy Shevchenko. They are from Afghanistan. Some 46 of them, stamped 'Field Mail,' were delivered to the serene and tranquil Ukrainian town of Kovel. There will be no more. On 12 November 1986, Yuriy Shevchenko died in battle.

"He was in control of his destiny. He himself made that choice. He wrote four reports requesting to be sent to Afghanistan. Read the letters, and you will sense neither boyish daring nor a youthful desire to distinguish himself. Behind the ordinariness and simplicity in every letter, there is amazing awareness of himself in this world—this severe, contradictory, restless world. He was not a grain of sand in it, this quiet young man whose life was only beginning. He chose his path, his road in it: Everyone has something of his own that is unlike others, but people also have something in common that links them—duty, honor, ideals. It is the understanding and awareness of this that give rise to the state of the soul customarily called spirituality. The strength of the human character and conduct is manifested in precisely this."

In the letters, Shevchenko tells how it was his own wish to serve in Afghanistan and describes his feelings about his family back home and life in the DRA. He writes in one letter: "I like serving. Believe me, I could not now serve anywhere as a clerk or anything else in the USSR. Here a young man quickly grows up, and in a few days it is possible to understand more than in several years of living at home. I have real friends here that I can always rely on."

In another letter, Shevchenko writes that he is now a junior sergeant in command of a battery transportation section ensuring safety of convoys on the Kushka-Kabul road.

The compiler of the feature writes that he learned of Yuriy Shevchenko's fate from a 5 August *Pravda* article entitled "I Did Not Send You to Afghanistan..." That article prompted him to contact Yuriy's father, who showed him his son's letters. The feature concludes with letters from Yuriy's commanding officer to his parents, condoling with them on their son's death:

"Who is to be blamed for this? We are honestly fulfilling our military, international, and constitutional duty, however hard it may be for us. This year alone, 1987, one of our men has died, and several have been injured. But I, my comrades, and fellow servicemen are not to blame for these losses. Who is, you ask? I can reply very modestly, it will indeed seem to you: Counterrevolutionary gangs of curs, emenies of the revolution, take our lives."

The officer goes on to say: "We were together on the day and at the hour of his death. On that day, Yuriy had volunteered to sit at the vehicle's controls as the senior and most experienced mechanic. When he was wounded, he told me that he wanted to live, and he said the same to the guys who accompanied him to hospital, but they did not get him there in time." He states: "Yuriy honestly fulfilled his military and international duty. In a combat situation, he was cool, decisive, and enterprising. In general, he was someone you could rely on."

East Europe

Projected Polish Economic Reforms Viewed

PM270855 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 15 Oct 87 Morning Edition p 4

[Own correspondent L. Toporkov "Letter From Warsaw": "Time of Important Reforms"]

[Text] As envisaged, this fall for Poland has proved to be a time of intense creative searches and unusually heated polemics, discussions, and passions concerning the problems which have attracted citizens' close attention and aroused sharp general interest. As is well-known, the PZPR Central Committee Fifth Plenum was held 8 October and was followed—on 10 October—by a regular session of Poland's Sejm. The question which it discussed is of the greatest importance for the country: The government program for implementing stage two of the economic reform and the radical reorganization of both the national economy and the supreme organs of state management—the center, as people say here.

Thus the interest is entirely legitimate and easily explained. After all, it is a question of the country's future, of the form that socialism will take in Poland, and of the living standard and democratization of society, and all this, of course, is of concern to everyone. The initiator of the changes—the PZPR—true to its principle of consulting the people, has supported the proposal of the Patriotic Movement for National Rebirth to submit to a national referendum the question of the radical reforms of economic and sociopolitical life. The answer to that question will be either "yes" or "no." The party is convinced that it will be "yes."

The Sejm alone is entitled to pose the referendum question. It also discussed it last Saturday, a truly historic day.

Prof Zbigniew Messner, chairman of the Polish Council of Ministers, delivered the report on the fundamental qualitative changes in the Polish economy to the Sejm deputies. He described the forces and processes which the government intends to bring into play to improve

and restructure the national economy. Above all, it intends to create the conditions to ensure efficiency and enterprise, particularly in the socialized sector, which is the main sector of the economy. These are ways to release the energy of society, this is the art of labor organization and the creative solution of problems. Furthermore, it is necessary to balance the national economy, to ensure that the market functions well, and that the zloty becomes a strong currency stimulating highly productive labor. The present phase of the reform is of special significance for the successful implementation of phase two. Changes in the functions and structure of the central organs of state administration are expected to provide a firm basis for restructuring.

What does this mean? The bold overhaul of the existing command-directive system, as it is known, a system which suffers from various bureaucratic ailments and which is not conducive to self-management and enterprises' independence. All too often the central administration has to tackle nonstate problems which could have been handled by lower levels of power. The result is that strategic tasks suffer. The proposed changes make it possible to focus the government's activity precisely on the country's development strategy and to make the central authority strong, representative of the interests of all of society, and capable of resisting the pressure of departmental interests. The government must govern and not merely manage.

Z. Messner presented the structure of the new organization of the supreme organs of state management. The number of ministries is being sharply reduced, to 16. For example, a single industry ministry is being created, responsible for all industrial policy, and several sectoral ministries are being abolished immediately. A single transport ministry is also being formed. It will henceforth be known as the Ministry of Transport, Shipping, and Communications. Its responsibility will include the management of the railroads and the post, telegraph, and telephones, and "Polish Airports," a new amalgamated enterprise. The ministries of education and instruction and of science and higher education are being abolished. They will be replaced by a new Ministry of Public Education.

The increase in the responsibility of enterprises for economic results and the role of market mechanisms and therefore the significance of commodity-money relations makes the role of the Finance Ministry more important. All financial policy will be concentrated in its hands. The banking system will have to be reorganized. The Government Planning Commission will coordinate the work of preparing and implementing the development program for the next 5 years and the longer term as well as major long-term activities.

"To try to express briefly what phase two of the reforms means," Z. Messner stressed, "it is the elaboration of a model of socialist enterprise. The principle 'everything which is not banned by law is permitted' is essentially the key to the creation of such a model and its further development. In the economic sphere it is necessary to end the situation created by bureaucratic barriers and characterized by the expression: 'The enterprise pretends that it is paying and people pretend that they are working.'"

The government is proposing to remove right now a number of restrictions and obstacles hampering economic initiative and to create the conditions for increasing collective and individual activity. It advocates incentives for initiatives aimed at business creation. From now on the functions of parent agencies will be carried out by banks as well as central and local administrations. The Sejm presented a draft law on economic activity. A completely new approach is proposed: Permission is not needed to begin such activity now, it is sufficient to register with the court. Such forms of activity as trade societies, whose fixed capital is provided from state resources and contributions by citizens, may be developed on a broad scale. The issue and sale of shares and bonds will be an effective source of raising finance. The possibility of leasing unused production capacities to economic organizations and individual legal persons is being examined.

The powers of people's councils and organs of local self-management are being expanded and their financial potential increased. A new form of ownership is being created—communal ownership. It will be completely under the control of people's councils.

The reform, the head of the Polish Government noted in conclusion, cannot be reduced merely to the restructuring of economic mechanisms. It is part of the process of socialist renewal and is augmented by changes in political life, the further development of democracy and self-management, and the reorganization of state structures. The success and effectiveness of the proposed measures will depend on the efforts of all citizens. Without the people's participation in the implementation of the reform program we face the threat of defeat, Z. Messner said, and it would be the lot not only of the government but of us all.

The decisions of the PZPR Central Committee Fifth Plenum and the speech in the Sejm by the head of the Polish Government gave rise to a lively discussion among the deputies of the Republic's supreme organ of power. They expressed support for the draft reform program. A special commission has been set up to scrutinize the draft laws on it. There is also considerable interest in the draft law on the changes in the administrative-procedural law, which is intended to improve the nature of relations between citizens and institutions (what is of prime importance here is mutual trust, which will exclude the need for all manner of warrants and documents and simplify dozens of administrative procedures).

The Sejm has adopted a resolution on holding a national referendum on a range of measures connected with the implementation of stage two of the economic reform and the further improvement of state organs, measures aimed, as the Sejm session emphasized, at achieving the harmonious development of the state and the fuller embodiment of the basic principles of the socialist system.

The referendum will be held on 29 November 1987. It will undoubtedly be a major social and political event in Poland's life and the expression of citizens' direct involvement in shaping state policy.

Ligachev, PZPR's Baryla on Construction

LD232032 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] Baryla, member of the Politburo and secretary of the PZPR Central Committee, stayed in Moscow on a working visit 22-23 October at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. He was familiarizing himself with the experience of the work of the CPSU in the sphere of the party and state construction. Comrade Ligachev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU, had a meeting with him. In the course of the conversation, which passed in a warm and friendly atmosphere, matters related to the further deepening of cooperation between the CPSU and the PZPR in light of the 27th CPSU Congress and the 10th PZPR Congress were discussed.

CPSU Leaders Address PZPR Functionaries

LD232023 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Text] A group of leading PZPR functionaries has visited the Institute for the Exchange of Experience in Socialist Construction of the Academy of Social Sciences, which is attached to the CPSU Central Committee. There was a discussion of topical issues concerning party guidance of the processes of restructuring and the acceleration of socioeconomic development in the USSR and Poland.

The Polish comrades were addressed by Comrades Yeltsin, Solovyev, Talyzin, Lukyanov, Medvedev, and Razumovskiy; heads of CPSU Central Committee departments; obkom first secretaries; ministers; chairmen of USSR state committees; and prominent scientists.

Dep Premier Silayev Receives SFRY Visitor

PM261647 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian24 Oct 87Second Edition p 3]

[TASS report: "Talk Held"]

[Text] I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers and chairman of the Soviet part of the Soviet-Yugoslav Intergovernmental Committee for Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation, received J. Srbovan, president of the SFRY Vojvodina Socialist Autonomous Province Executive Council, who is in the Soviet Union heading a Vojvodina delegation at the invitation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers.

The friendly talk that was held discussed questions of the state and further development of Soviet-Yugoslav economic ties, including questions of cooperation in the sphere of machine building.

M. Veres, SFRY ambassador to the USSR, took part in the talk.

Yazov Greets Romanian Defense Minister

PM261045 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 First Edition p 1

[Message from Army General D. Yazov, USSR defense minister, to Colonel General V. Milea, Romanian national defense minister]

[Text] To Comrade Col Gen V. Milea, Romanian minister of national defense

Esteemed Comrade Minister!

On behalf of the USSR Armed Forces and myself I send you and all Romanian servicemen sincere congratulations on the 43d anniversary of the Army of the Socialist Republic of Romania.

Soviet servicemen express the conviction that the relations of friendship and cooperation between our armies will continue to develop for the benefit of the peoples of the Soviet Union and Romania and in the interests of all countries of the socialist community.

On this notable holiday I wish the entire personnel of the Army of the Socialist Republic of Romania new successes in improving their combat skill for the consolidation of the defense capability of their motherland and all Warsaw Pact states.

With communist greetings

Army Gen D. Yazov, USSR Defense Minister.

Albanian Youth Union Congress Held

PM261605 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 p 3

[Unattributed report: "Youth Forum in Tirana"]

[Text] A report was delivered by Mehmet Elezi, first secretary of the Albanian Union of Working Youth Central Committee, at the Ninth Congress of the Albanian Union of Working Youth being held in Tirana.

Socialist Albania's young men and women are greeting the Ninth Albanian Union of Working Youth Congress with major achievements in all spheres, he pointed out.

The young generation is actively participating in fulfilling the decisions of the Ninth Albanian Workers Party Congress, which opened up new prospects for Albania, and in all the transformations which the country is experiencing. Young people's selfless activity at construction sites of the Eighth 5-Year Plan—such as the construction of the Milot-Rreshen-Klos Railroad—has become a school of labor for Albania's young men and women.

The young generation—society's most active force—will soon take up and carry onward the flame of revolution and socialist building. That is why the party has always attached particular importance to young people's revolutionary education.

Hungarian Private Bond Fundraising Plan

PM231305 [Editorial Report]—Moscow *Trud* in Russian 13 October 1987 carries on page 3 under the headline "Make Your Investment" a 900-word Own Correspondent N. Yugov Budapest dispatch on the Hungarian practice of the sale of bonds to the public to finance construction projects. A Finance Ministry staffer states that "the Hungarian population has now acquired bonds worth almost 17 million forints (R1 billion). The number of holders of these securities has reached 300,000." Yugov states that the funds have been used to build over 400 social and consumer projects, as well as to develop and ensure the "large-scale modernization" of industrial enterprises. Bonds have been issued by individual enterprises—one agricultural cooperative even preferred raising capital through bonds rather than through a bank because "the interest will stay in the village and go to improve peasants' living conditions." Yugov concludes that "the wide dissemination of bonds has been promoted by their high yields—up to 10 % and more—and by the right of citizens to redeem the securities at a bank on demand without any loss. This advantageous policy with regard to production bonds is producing good results."

GDR Warships End Visit to Leningrad

PM261035 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 87 First Edition p 3]

[Own correspondent Captain 1st Rank A. Zlydnev report:"Visit Ends"]

[Text] Leningrad, 14 Oct—The official friendly visit by a detachment of GDR warships under the flag of Admiral W. Ehm, GDR deputy minister of national defense and commander of the People's Navy, has ended.

Adm W. Ehm visited the M.V. Frunze Higher Naval School and acquainted himself with training facilities and the teaching process. He met officers of the GDR National People's Army who are studying at military academies.

An evening of combat comradeship between Soviet and GDR sailors was held at the Leningrad Sailors' Club. The guests from the GDR also saw the sights of Leningrad.

The detachment of GDR warships has sailed for home.

Nechayev Heads Delegation to Bulgaria

PM261329 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian25 Oct 87First Editionp 3]

[Unattributed report: "Trip to Bulgaria"]

[Text] A delegation of Soviet political workers headed by Colonel General V.S. Nechayev, deputy chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, was in Bulgaria 19 through 23 October at the invitation of the Bulgarian People's Army Political Main Administration.

The delegation was received by Col Gen M. Mitkov, chief of the Bulgarian People's Army Political Main Administration. There was an exchange of experience on topical questions of party-political work stemming from the decisions of the 27th CPSU Congress and 13th BCP Congress and subsequent plenums of the two fraternal parties.

The Soviet political workers visited Bulgarian military units, enterprises, and historical sites. Meetings took place with Bulgarian People's Army personnel and the country's working people.

The delegation returned to Moscow 23 October.

Shalayev, Delegation Depart for Bucharest

LD242336 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 24 Oct 87

[Text] Today a delegation of Soviet trade unions, headed by Comrade Shalayev, left Moscow for Bucharest at the invitation of the Central Council of the General Trade Union Confederation of Romania for an official, friendly visit.

Black Sea Sailors Arrive at SFRY Port

LD262316 Moscow in Serbo-Croatian to Yugoslavia 1700 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Today is the first day of an official friendly visit by Black Sea fleet ships to Split. The first such visit took place 30 years ago. Since then, Soviet sailors have often been guests in Yugoslav ports. Here we have one more such meeting.

The Black Sea fleet antisubmarine ship, *Komsomolets Ukrainiy,* and the destroyer *Nakhodchivy* have arrived in Split. Leading the detachment of sailors is Vice Admiral Anatoliy Kuzmin, first deputy commander of the Black Sea fleet. [name and title as heard] The Soviet guests will remain in Split for 5 days, where they will meet citizens and Yugoslav sailors, as well as giving concerts. The

Soviet sailors hope that their visit on the eve of the 70th Great October Socialist Revolution anniversary will contribute to strenthening the friendship between the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples and to broadening traditional ties between the two countries.

West Europe

EC Envoys Briefed on Soviet, U.S. Talks

LD271506 Moscow TASS in English 1444 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS—Soviet First Deputy Foreign Minister Yuliy Vorontsov met today with heads of diplomatic missions of the member countries of the European Communities—Denmark, Portugal, Great Britain, France, the Netherlands, Spain, Belgium, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ireland, Greece and Italy.

The diplomatic representatives were given detailed information about the chief content and results of the Moscow talks on October 22-23 between Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze and U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz.

Great importance was expressed of the new fundamental initiatives advanced by Mikhail Gorbachev during the conversation with Shultz with a view to settling the issue of the nuclear-space complex, including the conclusion of a Soviet-American agreement on medium- and shorter-range missiles, bringing closer the Soviet and American positions on substantial cuts in strategic offensive weapons under conditions of observance and preservation of the ABM Treaty.

It was pointed out that the Soviet leader's constructive stands, demonstrated during the contacts in Moscow, was practical implementation in the talks on vital issues of mankind of the philosophy of new political thinking and created favourable conditions for radical cuts in the levels of nuclear-missile confrontation in Europe and the world at large.

Necessary material conditions were being created for making a resolute turn in Europe towards building a common home based on principles of trust and cooperation.

It was a noble and important task of all countries to take part realizing available opportunities.

FRG's Kohl Welcomes INF 'Breakthrough'

PM271001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 16 Oct 87 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "H. Kohl: 'Unparalleled Breakthrough'"]

[Text] Bonn, 15 Oct—FRG Chancellor Helmut Kohl delivered the government "State of the Nation" statement in the Bundestag today, in which he touched on a number of topical international problems, including disarmament. The head of the Bonn government stated the Federal Republic's readiness jointly with its allies to develop all-embracing cooperation with the Warsaw Pact states, above all in the area of disarmament and arms control.

The accord in principle between the USSR and the United States on complete elimination of medium-range missiles, he said, signifies an "unparalleled breakthrough" in the cause of disarmament. For the first time, a whole category of weapons is to be eliminated on a global scale under the terms of a treaty. The chancellor expressed the hope that this first disarmament treaty will be signed this year at a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting. In his opinion, this will lead to a turn for the better in relations between West and East and will begin a long-term process of strengthening trust.

Reiterating Bonn's statement of its desire to "create a world with fewer weapons," the chancellor nevertheless was silent on the draft resolutions submitted for examination by the Bundestag by the SPD and the "Green" Party, which demand the immediate and unconditional elimination of West German Pershing-1A missiles with U.S. nuclear warheads.

Noting further that relations between West and East must not be confined to the area of disarmament and arms control, H. Kohl stressed the need to develop political dialogue between them and seek new forms of cooperation in the economy, science, technology, culture, and also the humanitarian sphere.

The chancellor stated that relations with the Soviet Union are of central importance for the FRG. The intergovernmental agreement on scientific and technical cooperation between the USSR and the FRG has come into force and within its framework there are three sectorial agreements between the two countries.

Opening the debate on the government statement, Hans-Jochen Vogel, president of the SPD, pointed out that for the first time since World War II, a treaty between the USSR and the United States not only on reducing but also on completely eliminating medium-range and operational-tactical missiles may become reality. This illustrates that security can only be guaranteed by joint efforts. At the same time, the SPD leader recalled that Bonn persistently opposed achievement of a Soviet-U.S. accord on this question.

H.-J. Vogel noted the great significance of the transformations in various spheres of Soviet society which, in his words, have changed the general atmosphere in Europe, including in the FRG. This is illustrated by the trust which, according to public opinion polls, the overwhelming majority of the West German population have in M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

FRG Ambassador Received by Soviet Officials

Meets With Shevardnadze

LD261822 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, a member of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee and foreign minister of the USSR, today received Andreas Meyer-Landrut, ambassador of the Federal Republic of Germany to the USSR, at the latter's request.

The meeting covered some issues of bilateral Soviet-West German relations, including those related to economic, scientific and technological cooperation between the USSR and the FRG, and pressing international problems of mutual interest.

Shevardnadze briefed the ambassador on the principal resutls of Moscow talks with U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, pointing out serious progress made during those negotiations in hammering out the more complex provisions of the future treaty on intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles.

He also stressed the high significance of new initiatives of fundamental importance, which have been set forth by Mikhail Gorbachev with a view to finding solutions as regards the reduction of strategic offensive arms.

The meeting touched on the issue of signing a convention to prohibit chemical weapons. The Soviet side in this connection expressed concern about the U.S. Administration's intention to launch the manufacture of binary munitions.

The ambassador of the FRG said his government welcomed the prospect that had opened for signing an agreement in the near future for abolishing intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles and was also for an agreement on 50-percent cuts in strategic offensive arms.

Talks to Vorotnikov

LD271240 Moscow TASS in English 1238 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 27 TASS—Vitaliy Vorotnikov, member of the Political Bureau of the CPSU Central Committee, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Russian Federation, received today FRG ambassador to the USSR Andreas Meyer-Landrut. In the course of the meeting, which was of a constructive and well-wishing character, were examined some questions of Soviet-West German relations, a further development of ties between the Russian federation and West German lands.

Gromyko Receives Italian Peace Group

LD261510 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1415 GMT 26 Oct

[Text] Moscow, Oct 26—TASS correspondent Valeriy Kostylev reports:

Today Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received a delegation of Italian peace fighters from the city of Assisi. They represent the international center "For Peace Between Peoples."

The goal of our trip to Moscow is to hand a message of peace from the city of Assisi to Andrey Gromyko, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, stated clergyman Nicolo Giandomenico [name as published], the leader of the delegation of Italian peace fighters, in an interview with a TASS correspondent. The delegation came to the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation.

The idea of an action we have called "Project Europe-87" was born at the international center "For Peace Between Peoples" represented by the delegation, the Italian clergyman noted. Its aim is to send delegations from Assisi to the leaders of all states to urge their governments and peoples to pay more attention to searching for specific possibilities for progress toward peaceful coexistence. We propose to look for new paths toward peace.

The delegation's head called "very fruitful" today's meeting in the Kremlin with Andrey Gromyko. I think it will remain in our hearts forever, thanks to this figure's openness, his humaneness and understanding for other people, Nicolo Giandomenico emphasized.

The Italian clergyman stressed that he hoped a Soviet-U.S. agreement on the liquidation of medium-range missiles and operational-tactical missiles would be signed soon. We want very much for the Soviet-U.S. dialogue to yield specific results, he said.

The emblem of the "Project Europe-87" is a dove with an olive branch. It is known throughout Italy, and people carry it at peace marches. Members of the International Center "For Peace Between Peoples" may go their own way in the peace struggle, yet their contribution to this struggle is a significant phenomenon which has attracted the attention of the European public.

Churches Play Peace Role

LD262123 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 TASS—Andrey Gromyko, president of the Presidium of the USSR Supreme Soviet, received in the Kremlin today a delegation of the International Centre for Peace among Nations, based in the Italian city of Assisi.

The head of the delegation, vicar of the St Francis Monastery, Nicola Giandomenico, said that their centre sent small groups of representatives with messages of peace to nearly forty countries of the world—practically all capitals of European countries. The Soviet Union is the first country to receive such a delegation. The Italian guests expressed special gratitude for that. An appeal to the heads of European states proposes, in particular, to hold a special meeting of heads of state, entirely devoted to the course of peace.

Accepting the appeal, Andrey Gromyko stated that the Soviet Union exerted every effort to remove the danger of a new war. Every man on earth needs to realise that the nuclear danger exists and a lot is yet to be done to remove it.

"It is good that the Catholic and Orthodox Churches and people of other faiths are aware of the danger looming large over the world," Andrey Gromyko said. "We heard the head of the Catholic Church make statements about the realisation of the nuclear danger during meetings in the Vatican. I twice met Pope Paul 6 and John Paul 2. It would be a good thing for the leadership of the Catholic Church to exert all its influence to assert life and prevent the war."

"As for the Soviet Union, our country is ready now to continue support contacts with a large number of foreign countries at various levels." Andrey Gromyko stressed.

He said that "some people are ready to discourse for hours on human rights, without mentioning that from birth man has the main right—that is the right to life. And it should be guaranteed. All people, irrespective of political views, outlooks and religious persuasions, must stand up for this right.

In international relations, peoples must rise above the transient considerations. Each nation, large or small, must cast aside all minor things and come to grips with the main problem—the prevention of the nuclear war. This is the main idea which underlies our foreign policy."

Then the guests were told that "the Soviet people were increasingly active in the topical and, let's put it straight, great course—the restructuring of all spheres of life of Soviet society. Hundreds of millions of citizens are involved in it.

"We are looking into the future with optimism. Many people abroad come to appreciate the developments in the Soviet Union and our domestic policy. They begin to understand that the events in the USSR will harm no one abroad.

"We are grateful for such an appraisal of our efforts by peoples of Europe. It is not by accident that you also note our common interest in European affairs. After all, as Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, stressed on more than one occasion, Europe is our common home. We wish you success in improving the situation in Europe and strengthening peace in the European home because yours is noble work."

Andrey Gromyko stated that "nothing can hamper friendly relations between the people of Italy and the Soviet Union, including between young people."

Visiting Swedish Air Force Head Interviewed

LD261739 Moscow TASS in English 1546 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Stockholm October 26 TASS—TASS correspondent Nikolay Vukolov reports:

Lieutenant-General Sven Olof Olson, commander of the Swedish air force, has granted an interview to TASS in connection with his official visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Aviation Marshal Alexander Yefimov, commander of the Soviet air force and a deputy defense minister of the USSR.

General Olson said he held a very positive view of the visit.

The Soviet Union and Sweden were neighboring countries located on the coast of the same sea and so it was important for them to have a good, goodneighborly relationship, he said.

The friendly visit, he added, was important also because it resumed contacts between representatives of the military circles of the two countries, which previously had been regular.

General Olson pointed to exchanges of visits between military pilots of the two countries, during which exhibition flights had been conducted both in Sweden and in the Soviet Union, as one example of such contacts.

He said that he himself had visited the Soviet Union in 1972 with a group of Swedish pilots on Draken fighters and that Soviet pilots had been hosted in Sweden as well, the last time in 1981.

General Olson said the experience of those visits had been positive and definitely helped each side to understand the other's problems better. That was why, he explained, he thought positively of exchanges of such visits.

General Olson noted that Sweden was a neutral country and was interested in exchanges and contacts with all other nations. It was, he added, a small country with limited resources and limited possibilities, which was why such visits could not be too frequent. That did not, he stressed, indicate a lack of willingness on Sweden's part, but was rather a practical matter of its possibilities.

The Swedish air force commander did not rule out, though, that such exchanges with the Soviet Union could resume in the near future.

He expressed satisfaction with the agreement in principle between the USSR and the United States to abolish intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles, saying he regarded as positive any step to ease tension and lower the level of nuclear arms.

General Olson voiced the hope that the reached understanding would produce a result serving the basis for further progress to cover other kinds of nuclear weaponry as well.

The Reykjavik summit had laid down the groundwork for the necessary mutual understanding between the two great powers, he said, adding one would like to hope that current developments would lead to another meeting at summit level, which would yield positive results.

General Olson added in this connection that Sweden already had no nuclear weapons on its territory and would continue that policy.

The Swedish air force commander noted also the positive thrust of the latest peace initiatives made by Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, in the Arctic city of Murmansk.

A detailed study of those proposals was continuing in Sweden, but it could already be said, General Olson continued, that the Swedish side believed it essential that along with limiting the intensity of naval activity on the seas, their international status, including that of the Baltic Sea, should be preserved.

General Olson said the decision on his visit had been taken by the Swedish Government which, he said, he believed was thereby seeking to emphasize its desire to maintain a good relationship with the Soviet Union.

The Swedish air force commander concluded that he therefore saw his visit as part of the Swedish Government's efforts to ensure a further positive development of relations with the USSR.

Latin America & Caribbean

Central American Peace Settlement Assessed

PM241245 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Oct 87 Second Edition p 6

[Special correspondent P. Bogomolov report under the rubric "Echo of Events: Rumors and Facts": "Glimmers of Hope"]

[Text] Managua, 11 Oct—In northern Nicaragua an unusual, even eerie silence reigns near the settlements of San Jose de Bocay and Plan de Grama. The ringing machine gun fire, rumble of howitzers, and the terrifying roar of helicopters are not to be heard. Here, in the jagged gorges of Nueva Segovia and Jinotega, as in the south of Zelaya Department, the government's decision on a unilateral cease-fire has just gone into effect. Some 450 square kilometers—a considerable area in relation to Nicaragua—have ceased to be a zone of military operations.

Along the rain-drenched country roads, hundreds of ordinary Nicaraguans are rushing toward the border point at Las Macos, hoping to see their relatives on the Honduran side. They are, for the most part, deceived people and thus sincerely seeking to restore their links with their homes. A "breach" has opened on the southern border with Costa Rica, too. There, in Los Chiles settlement, there has been a noticeable increase in trade ties and passenger and freight traffic between the two neighboring countries.

Rushing cars and buses overtake the pedestrians. Many members of the Nicaraguan bourgeoisie, intelligentsia, and the church are returning home. No wonder. After all, the image built up by Washington propaganda of modern Nicaragua as "one large prison" is collapsing before their very eyes. Yesterday's emigres see before them a country developing dynamically—albeit full of complex problems—believing in a better future, and free of all forms of dependence.

"Just look at how much has changed here recently," my old friend, the administrator of the Siete Mares Hotel, said. "Hundreds of people have been freed under amnesty and some contra formations have already laid down their arms. Furthermore, the procedure for confiscating the property of people who left the country has been revoked. Now their agents freely control the facilities abandoned by their owners. All this, of course, is helping to revive the private sector of the economy. In brief, there is greater stability, confidence, and calm."

Revolutionary Nicaragua has always advocated changes like those occurring now. But it is only now that they are becoming reality, after the well-known meeting between the presidents of the 5 states of the region in Guatemala 2 months ago. Having removed mutual suspicion and hostility, although by no means fully, the leaders of the Central American countries decided to begin the broad process of settling the protracted and bloody conflict in this part of the world.

According to the accord, international observers will sum up the initial results of implementing the Guatemalan Agreements at the beginning of November. It must be said, Nicaragua rightly expects to be named among those countries fulfilling its obligations. Nicaragua, unlike its neighboring countries, has not only set up a national reconciliation commission but has also begun a useful, even if sometimes highly contradictory, dialogue with opposition forces.

Press censorship has been lifted in the country. The opposition newspaper *La Prensa* is publishing again, and the religious radio station Radio Catolica has resumed its broadcasts. Having only just been allowed to work again, they are criticizing the government as much as they can. But what actually are they criticizing? It seems that some parties suddenly doubted the sincerity of the Sandinist authorities' desire to conduct a serious national dialogue and are thus threatening to withdraw from it.

Here is another unconvincing argument. A section of the opposition is demanding that, as a beginning, the state of emergency be lifted in the country... Then, they say, the leaders of the "Nicaraguan Democratic Forces" themselves will decide whether it is worth continuing the "undeclared war" against people's power. Do they think that they are dealing with simpletons, those who produce these "settlement options"?

The main claim of the opponents of the revolution and their Washington protectors is simple: The government must sit down at the negotiating table not only with the legal opposition but also with the criminal ringleaders of the contra armed groupings.

"Where does this demand come from?" *Nuevo Diario* writes. After all, the contras do not actually represent any sections of the population. They have admitted more than once that without U.S. aid they would soon have been routed. Can one really describe as "leaders of a peasant army" people who 8 years ago tortured their own people and by their dictatorial rule almost brought the country to national catastrophe?

These questions are far from rhetorical. It is no secret that in neighboring countries there is also a growing demand to end the power of the proimperialist oligarchy and its stooges. The opposition is at its height in El Salvador, seething with civil conflict. Incidentally, the long-awaited dialogue between the ruling Christian Democratic cabinet and the military-political opposition took place there recently.

Unlike fruitless talks of past years, this time the people's demands have not gone unanswered. The more favorable political atmosphere created by the Guatemalan accords, as well as the Salvadoran insurgents' successful combat operations, have forced the government to begin implementing its international commitments on national reconciliation in the country.

Two mixed commissions are being created based on results of talks and with the active mediation of the Catholic Church. One commission is designed to monitor a cease-fire, while the other is called upon to help implement the remaining provisions of the Guatemalan accords. The results of the commissions' work are due to be published by about November 4, but in any event within 4 months. It is clear that the very existence of this plan is a weighty contribution to improving the domestic political situation.

...The implementation of the Guatemalan accords is making difficult progress in the face of great problems. While paying lipservice to support for them, the Washington administration is in fact sabotaging the peace settlement and placing innumerable traps along the path of this process. It is comprehensively supporting and financing the region's reactionary forces. Nevertheless, the Latin Americans are learning a lot about the reality of things. The first outlines of a peaceful future for the "troubled region" are appearing in acute political confrontation and in constant discussions and debates.

U.S. 'Interference' in Guatemala Deal Noted

PM261643 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 15 Oct 87 First Edition p 3

[V. Vinogradov "Military-Political Commentary": "Spokes in the Wheel"]

[Text] A striking group of people in tattered American-type fatigues carrying U.S. weapons was moving down the main street of the small Nicaraguan city of Puerto Cabezaz. Their glances betrayed suspicion. It was clearly not easy for them to get used to the idea that it was no longer necessary to hide out in the jungle, that a return to normal life was possible.

The day before the command of the "Yatama" Indian counterrevolutionary organization had signed an agreement with the Sandinist authorities on a mutual cease-fire. Some 400 people from this grouping decided to take part in the peace process which has been initiated in the country. Most of them walked down the main street of Puerto Cabezaz.

The laws on amnesty and granting of autonomy to national minorities living on the country's Atlantic coast adopted by the Nicaraguan National Assembly played a decisive role in this step. Somewhat earlier, the border between Nicaragua and Honduras at Las Manos was opened for 6 hours. Nicaraguans from both sides of the border poured in to meet after years of separation. Dozens of families were reunited on that day. These are just some of the measures taken by the Sandinist government as part of practical implementation of the Guatemala accords on a peaceful settlement in Central America.

These accords were welcomed with great satisfaction by the world public. A few days ago, the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution in support of the Guatemalan agreement aimed at achieving a lasting and stable peace in Central America. However, this plan also has its opponents among influential U.S. circles. Speaking at OAS headquarters, the U.S. President was forced to admit that the Guatemalan document "contains many

elements which are essential to ensuring a lasting peace and democracy in the region." However, at the same time, despite obvious facts to the contrary, Reagan claimed that the Nicaraguan Government, which has already adopted unilateral steps in implementing provisions of this document, allegedly does not intend to observe its terms.

The U.S. President's speech confirmed quite clearly that the main element in Washington's policy toward Nicaragua remains crude interference in its internal affairs, with a view to achieving changes in the country convenient to the United States. Primarily it is a question of continued large-scale military aid to the contras, whom Reagan prefers to call "freedom fighters," no less. He said in part: "I have taken a solemn oath that as long as I live I will support, work for, and fight for the cause of the Nicaraguan freedom fighters. Therefore I will request and strive for military and humanitarian aid totaling 270 million dollars over 18 months to be granted to them."

Even the U.S. news media point out that the administration's "unacceptable demands" made to Nicaragua "obviously pursue the aim of thwarting the peace process in Central America." The White House, caught redhanded during the investigation of the "Irangate" scandal,*The Washington Post* writes, is now seeking to "legitimize" its bankrupt course and get Congress to pass appropriations to the contras, who were previously financed by means of secret U.S. arms deliveries to Iran. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, speaking in Chicago, frankly confirmed that the $270 million will be given to the contras irrespective of the results achieved in the course of peacefully settling the conflict.

The New York Times emphasizes that "Reagan wants to overthrow the Sandinistas so he can claim that he has delivered the Western Hemisphere from a Marxist government. However, he cannot achieve this by means of the Guatemalan peace plan, and therefore he wants to torpedo it in order to carry on the war by proxy." With a view to this, Washington is prepared to continue putting spokes in the wheel of the Central American settlement.

Reagan Meets With Honduran President Azcona

PM261619 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Oct 87 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Talks Between Presidents"]

[Text] Washington, 22 Oct—President R. Reagan received President J. Azcona of Honduras, who is here on a private visit, in the White House Wednesday [21 October]. At the talks, attended by C. Weinberger, U.S. secretary of defense, M. Armacost, under secretary of state for political affairs, and other ranking administration officials, discussions focused on the document on ways to establish a lasting peace in Central America, which was signed by the presidents of 5 countries of the region in the Guatemalan capital in August.

After the meeting, a ranking representative of the administration announced that during the talks in the White House, President Azcona noted the "general similarity of the positions of the United States and Honduras" in respect to the Guatemalan agreement. As is well known, the Washington administration is vigorously maneuvering behind the scenes in an effort to thwart implementation of this document, which stipulates a total discontinuation of outside aid to antigovernment groupings in the region.

As is well known, the U.S. Administration has already announced its intention to seek appropriation of another $270 million in aid to the contras, most of whom are based on Honduran territory.

The administration spokesman stated that President Reagan emphasized at the meeting that the United States regards Honduras as "a country of great importance" to U.S. interests. He promised continued U.S. aid to Honduras. During the period between 1981 and 1986, U.S. annual military aid to this country increased from $4.2 million to $79.4 million.

Peruvian President Garcia Interviewed

LD241510 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1455 GMT 23 Oct 87

[Interview with Peruvian President Alan Garcia Perez by unidentified Soviet correspondents; date and place not given—recorded, in Spanish with superimposed Russian translation]

[Text][Question] The recently published article by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, "Reality and the Guarantees of a Secure World", says that it is necessary to set up a system of comprehensive security. It analyzes the problem of economic security as an important and inextricable element of this system. It particularly stresses that alleviation of the burden of foreign debt on developing countries increases the possibility of a reliable future of the whole of humanity. How do you view this standpoint?

[Garcia] Mr Gorbachev's standpoint once again confirms that foreign debt is not an economic but a political issue. Peoples of underdeveloped countries should not be sacrificed through debt to banks of rich countries. We have the full right to pay back the debt with those commodities that we can produce inside the country, i.e. to pay it back with our labor.

As Mr Gorbachev correctly points out, the problem of security is closely linked to the whole world economic system. Ultimately, it is precisely economy that is the driving system of political systems. The more the world is divided into two camps— industrially developed and increasingly impoverished—the greater the danger of social violence. This is the main thing because this process is the most difficult for us to contain and discuss. Mr Gorbachev is absolutely right when he says that it is

not for philanthropic reasons that rich countries should allow the poor ones to pay less for their debt, but because this is the only way to revitalize the world economy, while rich countries, by acting in all fairness and by paying higher prices for our raw materials, will be able to make another leap in their economic development.

Thus, until capitalism finds a political and global solution of this problem, it will be in a state of deep crisis.

[Question] Mr President, 2 years have passed of the 5 years during which you will be performing your presidential functions. What plans have you managed to implement during this period, and what difficulties have you come across?

[Garcia] It seems to me that we have managed to implement a little from each targeted area. However, we have not managed to do everything we planned. I believe that, as regards international relations, Peru has managed to become a more independent and more autonomous country. For example, our position is firm, as far as paying our foreign debt is concerned: we confine our payments to a certain sum. As far as economy is concerned, we do not follow IMF recommendations and believe the state should be handling its economy itself by stimulating production within the country. This economic policy has given positive results. We have attained over the past 2 years more than over the last 25 years, during which we followed IMF recommendations.

Previously our state expressed the interests of the industrial oligarchy. Now we are aspiring to meet the demands of peasant communities and Indian settlements, where millions of Peruvians live and do not know what it means to be comfortable and well off. The state poses the task to resolve unemployment problems. We do not want to allow a small group of bankers to use their banks as a tool for exerting pressure on national enterprises. We have undertaken measures for nationalizing banks in order to hand them over to the state. By nationalizing banks we are trying to channel investments in production and attain a situation in which credit is not in the hands of large economic empires or industrial enterprises but is an instrument serving the whole society.

[Question] As is known, your government is playing an increasing role on the international scene. It is sufficient to mention participation in the Nonaligned Movement and the Support Group. Peru has repeatedly raised its voice in support of nuclear disarmament at the United Nations. What is the principal strategy of your policy?

[Garcia] Above all, we start from the understanding that in the present-day world, there is a close interconnection between the national policy and foreign policy of each state.

Our country faces a number of problems—poverty, poor development of our society, and colossal authority of the vast power which has ruled us all the last decades, as Europe did before. But our problems are only part of the problems of Latin America as a whole. We can only resolve them together. Our policy consists of achieving the integration of Latin America, not by bureaucratic methods or through signing agreements and setting up a common market. Those methods do not produce positive results. One must strive for adoption of common decisions. Today we all have one common problem: foreign debt. Each country is affected by it to a different degree. The peoples are demanding that their governments find a solution to that problem. We can observe that, for example, in Argentina and Brazil. I think such common problems may assist towards unification of Latin America in the face of the international capitalist system. One must not forget, either, that Latin America is part of the Third World. It participates in the Nonaligned Movement. There are also problems worrying in the same way both the Latin American peoples and your people, and the peoples of other countries. I have in mind the questions of security and peaceful coexistence. I also have in mind the problem of nuclear disarmament, which affects not only those who have nuclear weapons, but also us, mainly us.

[Question] Taking account of Peru's active role in support of the Contadora Group, I should like to know how you assess the present situation in Central America, in particular, the fact that the White House is striving to allocate another $240 million in aid to the contras.

[Garcia] I am an optimist in politics. I really believe that better times will come in the future. I think the situation in Central America is now better than it was 3 or 4 years ago. Several years ago the U.S. Administration possessed considerably more power within the country than now. Then the threat of invasion was guite possible and real. Here was the threat of direct U.S. interference in the region. Now we see that threat gradually weakening.

The meeting of five Central American presidents, with their different political platforms, laid the path to a peaceful resolution of the regional conflict, and to abstention from an escalation of violence. That is very important for us. Now a meeting is being prepared of the presidents of the whole of the Latin American continent.

In my opinion, that meeting will become an event of great political significance. First, we have never met before, with the exception of those cases when we were convened by the U.S. President. Therefore, I think the fact that we are meeting on our own initiative, and not because the White House wants it, is a historic fact, and one more step on the path toward liberation of Latin America. Second, we all face the same problems. Our democracies need strengthening, not only from within our countries but also on a continental scale. We must compare our economic problems. Our decisions regarding the foreign debt will gain force only when we act jointly, and not individually. There have already been presidents in Latin America who tried to find a solution to the foeign debt problem. So far, one has proposed

some kind of solution, and the others have attempted to agree with the IMF. Then another found some kind of solution, and the first was already holding talks with that fund, and so on. I proposed this: Let us unite, and we will present a united front. We will take the same decision. That will be an historic event, and it will confirm our unity.

[Question] At the time when a conference was taking place in New York on the link between disarmament and development, Comrade Gorbachev sent a message to those taking part, which stressed that implementing the basic principle of disarmament for development can and must rally mankind and help it to work out a new world wide consciousness. In the same message, the USSR proposed that an international disarmament for development fund should be set up within the UN framework to convey to developing countries the resources to be liberated during the disarmament process. How do you assess these proposals by our country?

[Garcia] I consider that Moscow has great understanding for the Third World. The USSR, a great power, takes into account not only its confrontation with the other great power but goes carefully into the essence of problems of those without such a high level of development. In this connection, I consider that the USSR, having put forward the slogan of disarmament for development, has brought together into a single whole two very important questions.

When I see the pyramids of Egypt, I see the enormous labor that is sometimes put into useless things. Hundreds of thousands of Egyptian slaves built these pyramids in order to perpetuate the memory of one man, the Pharaoh. I think the Star Wars program is in some way similar to these enormous pyramids. It is the embodiment of human vanity, of a striving to dominate, to hold power and exert hegemony, at the heart of which lies spiritual poverty. I believe the Soviet Union and Mr Gorgachev, who, I hope, at some time will visit Latin America, hold concrete evidence that they clearly understand Third World problems.

Your country is a bold one. Despite what was predicted by those who wish it ill, it has embarked upon the path of reform. You declared a unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests and put forward far-reaching proposals on disarmament. You move to meet the countries of the Third World and struggle for Soviet society's modernization. We follow restructuring and democratization of your life with affection and wish you further success in implementing goals proclaimed by the October Revolution, the 70th anniversary of which is being marked this year.

[Question] A complete halting of nuclear tests is one element capable of applying a sharp brake to the arms race. As is known, the Soviet Union, acting unilaterally, closed down its nuclear testing ranges for 1.5 years and called upon the other nuclear powers, and primarily the United States, to join in the Soviet moratorium. Unfortunately a cloud was cast over this practical step by the Soviet Union by endless explosions on the Navada testing ground. The echo of nuclear explosions is also resounding from the Mururoa Atoll in the Pacific Ocean. In the opinion of several Peruvian and other Latin American scientists, these explosions have encouraged seismic activity observed in this region. So what feelings do reports about new nuclear explosions arouse in you as a person and as a statesman?

[Garcia] Alarm and pain on behalf of humanity: pain that the mighty force of nuclear energy is being used only as a means of deterrence. It reminds one of the days when a Neanderthal man picked up a stone cudgel to intimidate another Neanderthal man. They are resorting to the same methods today. Only today, the teeth that are bared are nuclear teeth. When I heard that the Soviet Union had decided to suspend nuclear tests on a unilateral basis, I thought it was excellent. Resolve is needed. Until then, it was possible for someone to say: Let's halt tests simultaneously. Or: You stop them first, and then I'll do so afterwards. But it is truly important that one party said: I have decided to halt them for 1.5 years, and it doesn't matter whether you do the same or not, though it would be a good thing if you did do so. The most important thing in man remains his spiritual world, despite the bombs, the money, the material blessings.

In this connection, the important thing was that the Soviet Union, having stopped the nuclear tests, set a moral example. Perhaps not a great deal was able to be gained as a result of this. That is not the main thing. It was a moral victory which gave rise to hope at the present worrying time, when nuclear tests are continuing on Mururoa, in Nevada, and in other parts of the world.

[Question] The world community is noting how the rhythm of life in the USSR has changed sharply following April, 1985. This rhythm is reflected both on the domestic policy of the USSR and on its external policy. What is your opinion about restructuring and glasnost in the USSR?

[Garcia] I value highly Mr Gorbachev's efforts, and I consider that over the past year his activity on the international arena and in domestic policy symbolizes further development of the process begun in your country in 1917. What we are speaking about is universal movement toward restructuring and democratization, which is being carried out with due observance of the standards of justice and relying on the planning system. In this sense, I think that Mr Gorbachev has made great efforts to improve the situation. We value this very highly and follow events in your country with affection.

[Question] In conclusion, we would like to hear your assessment of Peruvian-Soviet relations.

[Garcia] We are a small country situated on the other side of the globe from you. We are striving now to urge on Latin America and to rally it so that it might have greater foundation for acting as a single people, like your own Soviet people. Your country has paid a high price and has made great sacrifices for the right to call itself a great power, strong in its material and military base. We would like to go on to develop further our relations with the USSR in culture and technology. We would also like to recall once again that the battle for world leadership is won not by the one who emerges victorious from the negotiating table of the two great powers, but by the one who begins to sit down at the negotiating table with the Third World. For its own part, Peru is always ready to make its contribution to the cause of peace, or peaceful coexistence and of the equal and just development of the whole of mankind.

Political and Social

Shevardnadze Speaks At Foreign Ministry

18070004A Moscow VESTNIK MINISTERSTVA INOSTRANNYKH DEL SSSR in Russian No 2, pp 30-34

[Text of speech by E.A. Shevardnadze at the meeting of the aktiv of the Diplomatic Academy, the Institute of International Relations, and the Central Apparat of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 27 June 1987, under the rubric "At the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs". Boldface as published]

[Text] The meeting of the aktiv of workers of the higher education system of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs represents an organic part of the measures of the leadership and party committee of the Ministry begun in May of last year with a general Ministry conference in which General Secretary of the CPSU Central Committee M.S. Gorbachev took part and gave the program speech.

The idea of creating a modern system of education, which he expressed in the report at the June 1987 Plenum of the CPSU Central Committee, strengthens our conviction that the higher education element is one of the key elements for the future of our system.

We know that it has become weakened and we know why it has become weakened and we know how to strengthen it. That will be what I will speak of. But first I consider it absolutely necessary to show how directly and immediately this measure is linked with the January and June plenums of the Central Committee.

I dare say you have read M.S. Gorbachev's report at the June Central Committee Plenum. Nonetheless, I will allow myself to focus your attention on several conclusions from the report and from the decisions of the Central Committee Plenum which characterize both the forum and the specifics of the current moment. I am deeply convinced that these conclusions have both a program and a practical work application significance for us.

The first conclusion: the political situation in the country has fundamentally changed in the 2 years which have passed since the April 1985 Central Committee Plenum. Restructuring, which has become the core and essence of the nationwide movement to renew life, has demonstrated how great and significant are the creative forces of socialism which can be improved on their own basis. By the very fact of the holding of such a plenum, and in such an atmosphere, a great political, ideological, and moral victory has been won.

The second conclusion: restructuring has become irreversible and there can be no turning back. At the Central Committee Plenum the talk was of deepening, expanding, and enriching the processes of democratization and further affirming the principle of openness; and all this means only one thing: there will be no retreat or stopping.

The third conclusion: restructuring is the process of overcoming the real contradictions in society's development and a deeply interpreted, directed process based on a clear understanding of why and how the deformations occurred and how to overcome them. In light of this restructuring resolves not only pressing daily problems and unblocks those contradictions which form the main elements of mechanical retardation. Its main goal is to achieve a new qualitative condition of socialist society in the shortest time possible.

The fourth conclusion: by encompassing the entire sociopolitical and economic system and taking into account the dynamics of social and individual interests, in other words, by dealing with work on an enormous scope and in enormous volume, restructuring inevitably acquires long-term character. This is the origin of the definite phased quality and the sequence of actions and measures with the logic and leading idea characteristic of each stage. In other words, this is not a traditional plugging of holes and not accident-rescue work with a limited goal; it is a deeply thought-out strategy. It is a considered course tested with objective necessity.

The following conclusion characterizes the specific nature of the moment in which developing and deepening democratization encompasses all sides of life. Just as it is absolutely true that all of us need to study democracy, so can it be said that democratization is both a means of restructuring and its goal.

Speaking without exaggeration, the June Central Committee itself was an impressive and deeply meaningful lesson of democracy.

Restructuring in all its aspects, whether they are socioeconomic, political, or spiritual-moral, and in all spheres of our reality reveals the great effectiveness of the new political situation which has been created. This includes a certain improvement in economic indicators—an increased growth rate in labor productivity and industrial production as a whole, the awakening of social thought which manifests itself in the open functioning of public opinion of the broadest range, a real literary-artistic boom, an outbreak of historical memory, interest in history, and profound changes in the ethics of labor, and, of course, the powerful influence of the events occurring in the country on the state of affairs in the world.

A characteristic feature of recent times—respect for truth and the indisputable priority of truth—was manifested at the June Central Committee Plenum again but more graphically than ever. Not one bad side of our society nor one defect in its existence was hidden.

The draft of the radical reform of management of the economy worked out by the party represents the high point of restructuring, its peak; the ascent to it makes very complicated demands on all those engaged in social production.

I foresee the question: on us too? What relationship does the problem of the fundamental restructuring of management of the economy have to us? After all, we do not seem to be directly engaged in social production.

If the idea that foreign policy is an extension of domestic policy is true—and it undoubtedly is true—and if the thesis that the goal of diplomacy is to form an external environment that is favorable for internal development is correct—and it undoubtedly is correct, then we are compelled to recognize that the backwardness of our power and its steady loss of its status is partially our fault too.

Beyond the borders of the Soviet Union you and I represent a great country which in the last 15 years has been steadily losing its position as one of the leading industrially developed countries. The corresponding figures are given in the report, and I already said why they should serve as a reproach to us too. The country's foreign policy service did not manage to deliver the warning signals about our lagging behind in the scientific-technical revolution in time, did not predict the structural reorganizations in the world economy, and did not caution against lopsided infatuation with trade in energy products. If we are finally honest, we frequently encouraged and at times even induced enormous material investments in hopeless foreign policy projects and tacitly promoted actions which both in the direct and the indirect sense have cost the people dearly even to this day. And we coordinated foreign economic and scientific-technical cooperation very badly or, to put it differently, not at all.

The fact that the foreign policy service—one of the most important and most sensitive links in the system of state management—carried out its obligations out of touch with the country's fundamental vital interests is on our conscience. This is most assuredly real narrow departmentalism when the function of foreign policy appears as a goal in itself.

It should not be that way now.

What follows from the decisions of the June Central Committee Plenum for us, the workers of the foreign policy service?

Here we should be guided first of all by the basic provision that foreign policy should provide favorable conditions for resolving our state's domestic tasks.

The main thing is that the country not incur additional expenses in connection with the need to maintain defensive capability and protect its lawful foreign policy interests. This means that we must seek ways to limit and reduce military rivalry, eliminate confrontational features in relations with other states, and suppress conflict and crisis situations. We must do all this, of course, without sacrificing our principles, class interests, and our ideals.

The present period strongly demands that we improve assistance to state organs in organizing international cooperation—in economics, science, trade, and ecology—which will promote the maximum degree of success in our economic reform.

If we are speaking in the style of the Central Committee Plenum, then we must increase the profitability of our foreign policy and try to reach a situation where interrelations among states encumber our economy as little as possible and create a stable psychological atmosphere in which Soviet people can work peacefully.

The decisions of the Central Committee Plenum oblige us to take economic methods into account in foreign policy too. In policy one can practically always act using different methods and choose tactical courses in trying to achieve the goals set. In other words, variants are possible. Each variant has its price. In checking the variants and proposing decisions and recommendations, we must also compare material expenditures. And the cost-cutting principle must be introduced in policy too.

The transition to this type of analysis will demand raising by an order our ideas of the factors which influence the implementation of policy and of the validity of one political choice or another.

We produce or we should produce a special type of product whose price now exceeds the cost of all things known to mankind. This product is political thought and political thinking, for some time now new political thinking.

We have had to say more than once that this product of ours is completely competitive on the world market, to speak more precisely, in the world arena where the major political intellects of contemporary times are waging the most acute single combat. Moreover, for some time, since April 1985, to be precise, this product with the stamp "Made in the USSR" has undoubtedly been gaining the upper hand, at times returning lost status to our foreign policy.

But if we speak frankly, the present MID [Ministry of Foreign Affairs] share in this product cannot satisfy us. Its production is set up in the highest echelons of the

leadership of the party and the country. By this I do not want to say that we are standing completely aside. On the contrary, certain workers in the central apparat and overseas establishments make a considerable contribution to the CPSU Central Committee Politburo in working out our innovative foreign policy strategy.

But, again speaking frankly, there are very few such workers.

Let us return to the economy. The basis of the economy continues to be series, stereotypes, and models. However, first, output is becoming more and more highly technological and more and more impregnated with the intellect of its inventor and creator. Secondly, series production is becoming flexible, that is, quickly readjustable.

If we apply this analogy to our MID work, we must admit that our series production is not technological enough, or, simply speaking, scientific enough; it is designed and done on the basis of outdated models and its rapid updating using standards that meet today's demands is not envisioned.

It is now necessary to look into the future and try to determine what kind of specialists the times now demand. And here the link between the economy and diplomacy is also a very direct one.

First, pardon the banality, a progressive, upward-moving economy is always a product of progressive thought.

Second, a diplomat who does not possess economic knowledge, does not fill his foreign policy actions with economic content, and does not know how to determine the economic effect or losses certain diplomatic actions bring to the country no longer meets today's demands.

Here I am in earnest approaching the basic theme of our conversation, it seems. What kind of specialist do we need today? Tomorrow? In 5 or 10 years? What is there that does not satisfy us in today's MGIMO [Moscow State Institute of International Relations] and Diplomatic Academy students?

Allow me in answering these questions to select the associative method.

Recently Mrs. Thatcher reminded us that "our" Yevgeniy Onegin knew the work of "their" Adam Smith quite well. For the English prime minister this was a rhetorical device and for us it was a reminder of the breadth of the range of interests and general great culture of our ancestors and their broad knowledge, including economic knowledge.

The question is quite often debated: should VUZ's today train a narrow specialist or a person endowed with great general culture?

I know that the MGIMO rectorate even tried to create a model of the ideal graduate using a survey of USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs administrations and departments.

I have decided not to present my model. I will express only one desire: with the greatest general and special professional culture, a graduate of the Institute or the Academy must think, I repeat—think, on the level of today's demands. Unfortunately, my observations indicate that the ability to operate in the mode of thinking necessary in our day is not adequately developed. It may also be because unthinking readiness to perform continues to be encouraged.

Completing the theme of associations, I want to tell about only one lesson of the past which must be continually remembered. Our diplomacy has gained a great deal from the fact that young people who have received excellent preparation in the families of professional diplomats have come to MGIMO. And our diplomacy has lost a great deal from the fact that a definite gap has existed between the students' knowledge and morality, and between the competence of the teachers and their lowered scale of ethical values.

What can be said here? I think there is one thing to say. While orienting oneself to the criterion of talent, we in our service should only encourage spiritual kinship among talented people.

I must qualify that: I do not consider myself to have the right to preach how to teach and how many hours to spend on some particular subject. This is the work of methodologists, pedagogues, offices of the dean, rectors, and learned councils.

But the leadership of the Ministry for whom we are training cadres is obliged to formulate the demands for the level of training of the diplomat and its understanding of this profession and to express certain views on what conditions and what environment should be created in higher education to insure that future specialists with the highest qualifications are raised.

Different times make different demands on specialists.

Today we are speaking of the future.

Never before in its entire history has the Soviet Foreign Policy Service had to resolve such great and important tasks as now. To do this it needs a qualitatively new and higher professional level. However, today this is surely impossible to do by conforming to personal precepts and preferences. The appropriate criteria should be developed only on the basis of strictly scientific optimal recommendations.

In order to impart a practical orientation to our conversation, I am obliged to state the ideas of the world and our own place in it from which we are proceeding. In other words, what, exactly, do we ask you to bear in mind in your indoctrinational and educational work?

—On the level of policy we see the world as a unified whole in which common human interests and democratism in international relations will become ever more decisive factors. Peaceful coexistence of states will be strongly confirmed as the universal principle of interrelations of states.

—On the level of military security we are trying to achieve a world without nuclear and chemical weapons and with continually decreasing arsenals of all other arms and a world based on an all-encompassing system of international security.

—On the level of the economy we will face an ever more interrelated and interdependent world in which cooperation within the framework of fair economic relations will be the basis of universal well-being.

—On the spiritual level it will be a world of extensive and close communication of nations and people, diversity of cultures, and the formation of a new humanism in keeping with a demilitarized nonviolent world and the idea of peace as the highest value.

These ideas on the world reflect and express our class interests in conditions of the nuclear and space age.

It is precisely socialism, which has proclaimed peace to be the highest value, that sees its highest class interest in preserving peace and eliminating the threat of the destruction of mankind. And only in conditions of peace and in normal international relations can socialism reveal its advantages.

The arms race is preventing socialism from developing in the very same way that confrontation, sanctions, and discriminatory practices in international division of labor hinder socialism.

The Soviet Union is prepared to actively cooperate with all countries to insure that this understanding of the world triumphs. We have made practical proposals on this account and developed models of the major parts of the edifice of the future. This was done in M.S. Gorbachev's Announcement of 15 January 1986 and in his Political Report to the 27th CPSU Congress, in the speech in the Indian Parliament in November of last year and in the Delhi Declaration signed then, and in the speech at the Moscow Forum.

Soviet diplomacy has a clear goal before it—to materialize the concept of the new political thinking in international-legal norms and principles.

The task seems to be formulated in a simple way. Some of our opponents say that this is utopia or propaganda. But after Reykjavik and after our European initiatives, the idea of a nonnuclear world seems more and more realistic.

I would like to specially talk about one feature. There was a time when crucial themes were not dealt with and, moreover, opinions which were harmless but differed from official opinions were not expressed. That time has now passed. But look at what is happening. Bold, interesting, and controversial articles have appeared on many basic questions of domestic life in all its manifestations, party and state construction, the economy, culture, art, and science. But there is nothing like it in the field of foreign policy. Is it really because everything is correct with us and variants other than those which are being implemented do not exist?

The intellectual tone has been greatly reduced. Debates are rare. In my opinion, the environment surrounding a young person does not encourage the awakening in him of the ability to think perceptively and originally.

Even in our domestic work nothing is questioned and no decisions other than those officially approved are proposed.

Will we admit such conformism today? Or do comrades believe that in foreign policy one cannot act otherwise?

This question is not so much one of the educational process as of molding the posture in life of the future specialist.

This is the demand that we make: our eductional institutions must march ahead of the Ministry and first of all teach "diplomatic technology" to the new generation. And one must understand that the educational institution's task is not to teach how to write papers correctly, that is, observing the formalities, but rather how to know what to write and how to think.

Here we are approaching the fundamental question: what is "knowledge"? I do not have pretensions to any scientific definitions. I want to pose this question on the level of a practical discussion and as applied to our needs, as I picture them.

I think that it is difficult to be a good worker wihout a strong base of humanitarian education. I am certain that common culture and morality make the difference in the classroom. History, philosophy, literature, art in general, law, and economics are mandatory elements of culture. It is a bad thing when these courses are eliminated or shortened.

The practice of contemporary international relations should also encourage the intellectual climate. But of course, the practical thought of our leading diplomats deserves to become part of the theoretical baggage of

future diplomats. The matter must be organized so that what is happening now at the Geneva negotiations on nuclear and space weapons interests students and so that they analyze and evaluate the speeches being published by Yu.M. Vorontsov, V.P. Karpov, A.A. Obukhov, and their opponents—Kampelman, Glitman, and Nitze.

Everything that is now occurring in Geneva is a prologue to a nonnuclear world and is history at the moment of its creation. The same thing can be said about negotiations to ban chemical weapons at the Geneva Conference on Disarmament, to formulate the concept of an all-encompassing system of international security, on the Helsinki process, and on the state of affairs at the Vienna Meeting of the SBSY [possibly Helsinki Pact] participating States.

If students understand the importance of these problems and keep them in active focus and test themselves in formulating arguments and positions, we will certainly not worry about the professional level of those who come to work at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs tomorrow.

According to the classic definition, a diplomat should be a communicative person who knows how to hold a discussion, an argument, and a polemical conversation. Do students have opportunities to develop these qualities?

Press conferences, briefings, and interviews have certainly become part of the practices of our diplomatic service. Do our students often have the opportunity to test themselves in this role? Moreover, are they often at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs press center in general?

Many questions of this type can be posed. I do not know how to best solve them, but we must seek a solution.

We must think about improving the teaching of languages.

I would like to deal separately with the question of the retraining of cadres who are already working in our system.

The theme of cadre ballast is constantly raised at our meetings devoted to the course of restructuring. The certification now taking place in the Ministry has also revealed quite a large number of alarming cases which confirm that there are serious problems with the professional training of quite a broad circle of associates.

And it is becoming clear here that with a well organized system for training cadres and increasing their skills, a large part of those who are now considered in one way or another part of the "cadre ballast" can be returned to the system of active workers.

But that is not the point. Every person must study, especially in our time. Only a few can and do study constantly by themselves; others must be helped and conditions for updating their intellectual and professional resources must be created.

In concluding my speech, I would again like to express the hope that both MGIMO and the Academy will regain their former prestige. I would also like to assure you that in the Ministry we will do everything necessary to accomplish this.

Restructuring is a continuous and constant process and a uniform and effective system for training, retraining, and raising the skills of cadres must be built on these same principles. This system is presently being set up too slowly among us, but I hope that our meeting today will give it a strong impetus.

In speaking I have been frank. I hope to hear direct impartial statements from you as well, but only to the point. And the point is this: peace and security are built by people and the people for that are being trained here, inside these walls.

Let us answer the question: how? Let us together reflect upon what must be done and how, to insure that the level of their training corresponds to the level of our plans and causes.

Ministers' Council Meets on Plan Fulfillment

PM261529 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Oct 87 Second Edition p 2

[Unattributed report under general heading "In the USSR Council of Ministers"]

[Text] A USSR Council of Ministers session held 23 October discussed the question of measures to complete the fulfillment of the State Plan for the Economic and Social Development of the USSR for 1987 and ensure steady progress by the national economy in 1988.

It was noted at the session that the intensive work developed throughout the country to implement the tasks set by the party to accelerate socioeconomic development, the deepening process of democratizing society, the increasingly broad participation by working people in the management of the economy, and the Soviet people's greater political and labor activity in the struggle to worthily greet the 70th anniversary of the Great October Revolution are producing positive results with regard to meeting the plan targets set for 1987.

The USSR Council of Ministers stressed that in the light of the directives of the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) Plenum and the decisions of the Eighth Session of the USSR Supreme Soviet, 11th Convocation, it is necessary to intensify the pace of work and organize precise, well coordinated work in all production sectors in order to unconditionally meet the current year's

targets, create the necessary reserves for the national economy's continued dynamic development in 1988, and improve Soviet people's wellbeing on this basis.

Summing up the results of work in the first 9 months of this year, the USSR Council of Ministers noted that ministries in the fuel and energy and metallurgical complexes—which have secured plan targets for the output of the main types of products—have improved their performance. Some positive results have also been achieved in the agro-industrial complex. More livestock, poultry, milk, and eggs were purchased than last year. The scale of housing and sociocultural construction has increased. A total area of 57.5 million square metres of housing has been commissioned using state capital investments, which is 14 % more than the same period last year. A series of measures have been implemented to increase wages. Public consumption funds have increased.

At the same time, there are still serious shortcomings in the work of many USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers connected with meeting the targets set for this year, which is having a negative effect on the development of the national economy as a whole. Produced national income for January through September this year increased by only 2.4 %, social labor productivity rose by 2.5 %, and growth in industrial output reached 3.6 %, which is below the plan for 1987.

The USSR Council of Ministers drew the attention of the USSR Council of Ministers Machine Building Bureau and the heads of the ministries incorporated in this complex to the fact that the extremely unsatisfactory situation which has prevailed since the beginning of the year is being rectified only slowly. All the machine building ministries, with the exception of the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry, are still behind with the production program. Their production shortfalls amount to more than R1.8 billion. The USSR Ministry of the Machine Tool and Tool Building Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Electrical Equipment Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Heavy and Transport Machine Building are particularly unsatisfactory.

It was pointed out to the heads of the USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers that they have slackened in their work to ensure fulfillment of delivery contract pledges. In the period from January through September delivery shortfalls amounted to R10.5 billion. As much as 60 % of all machine building enterprises and one in two enterprises under the USSR Ministry of the Coal Industry and the USSR Ministry of Ferrous Metallurgy have failed to honor their pledges. The fulfillment of contracts has deteriorated in the chemical and timber complex, particularly in the wood processing and pulp and paper industry.

The state of affairs with regard to fulfilling the plan for the development of the sociocultural sphere was also comprehensively discussed. The USSR Ministry of Light Industry leadership was strongly criticized. The USSR Ministry of the Radio Industry, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Communications Equipment Industry, the USSR Ministry of the Chemical Industry, the USSR Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances, and the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry have also failed to fulfill the plan for consumer goods production.

The necessary turning point has not been reached in the work of the construction complex. The annual plan for commissioning fixed capital using state capital investments has been fulfilled by less than 50 %. Targets relating to the commissioning of general educational schools, vocational and technical schools, preschool institutions, hospitals and clinics, and clubs and cultural centers have not been secured.

The session indicated the ineffectuality of measures taken by the USSR Ministry of Trade, the Tsentrosoyuz, union republic Councils of Ministers, and state trade and consumer cooperative organizations and institutions to fulfill the retail trade plan.

The USSR Council of Ministers demanded that USSR ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, and USSR Council of Ministers standing organs take exhaustive measures to meet the targets set for the fourth quarter and 1987 as a whole. It was stressed in this connection that in order to fulfill the annual plan, an industrial production output growth rate of no less than 4.4 % will have to be ensured in the fourth quarter against the planned target of 3.9 %.

In view of the fact that the national economy is entering the most difficult winter conditions, USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers must strictly monitor completion of preparations in the housing, utilities, and energy sectors for the fall and winter period and take full account of errors made last year.

The USSR Council of Ministers drew the attention of USSR ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, and economic managers to the need to conduct all organizational and practical work to ensure the fulfillment of plan targets on the basis of the CPSU Central Committee October (1987) plenum's fundamental directive indicating that the national economy has now reached a crucial stage in the restructuring process. Economic management at all levels should take full account of next year's special features: Enterprises and associations which account for 60 % of all industrial output will be switching to the principles of economic

accountability and self-financing, the provisions of the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association) will come into effect, and the scope of the state acceptance system will be increased.

The special significance of 1988 is that the stability of the national economy must be ensured and the pace of its development must be more rapid than in the first 2 years of the 5-year period. The average annual economic growth indicators must exceed those envisaged by the 5-year plan target for this year.

The USSR Government requires ministries and departments to ensure the earliest possible completion of enterprise and association economic contracts for next year as well as stronger, broader direct links between consumers and producers as the basis of steady progress by the national economy from the beginning of next year.

USSR ministries and departments and union republic Councils of Ministers have been set the task of accelerating the commissioning of fixed capital and concentrating funds and resources on the most important production projects. Another important task must be resolved at the same time: The housing construction program must be completed in full and the material base of the sociocultural sphere strengthened.

The need for the priority solution of social questions was particularly stressed. All potential to increase consumer goods production and services and improve the population's supply of foodstuffs and other high quality goods must be actively exploited.

Working on the basis of the assessments and conclusions given at the CPSU Central Committee conference on the questions of accelerating the development of processing sectors in the agro-industrial complex, the USSR Council of Ministers drew the attention of USSR ministries and departments, union republic Councils of Ministers, and all economic organs to the fact that retooling these sectors on a modern technical basis and efficiently resolving the problems of storing, transporting, and processing agricultural produce is a most urgent task. Meeting the targets set in this sphere must be assiduously monitored as a task of national political importance.

The session also discussed the question of progress made in implementing CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers decisions to develop cooperatives and individual labor activity.

It was noted that definite work is being done throughout the country to form cooperatives in the following spheres: consumer goods production, consumer services, public catering, and the procurement and processing of secondary raw materials. More than 8,000 cooperatives exist at present. More than 200,000 people are engaged in individual labor activity.

At the same time, the USSR Council of Ministers pointed out that the potential for cooperative forms of production is being used extremely poorly. Work to form cooperatives is unsatisfactory in the Turkmen SSR, Tajik SSR, Kirgiz SSR, and also a number of oblasts in the RSFSR. Only a small number of cooperatives have been formed in public catering, consumer goods production, the manufacture of confectionery and baked goods, the construction of ancillary buildings for orchards, market gardens, and subsidiary plots, and apartment repairs.

Local administrative organs have yet to become the real organizers of cooperatives and individual labor activity. In a number of instances they take an unenterprising, uninterested attitude to this task. Questions of providing cooperatives with premises, equipment, and means of transport are slow to be resolved. They are given little assistance by USSR Gossnab territorial organs.

The USSR Government has instructed union and autonomous republic Councils of Ministers and local soviet ispolkoms to take measures to unconditionally implement decisions to broadly develop cooperative and individual forms of organizing consumer goods production and consumer services. The USSR Council of Ministers Bureau for Questions of Social Development, the USSR Ministry of Finance, and union republic Councils of Ministers have been instructed to examine questions which arise when forming cooperatives and stem from their work and also to prepare and submit corresponding proposals to the USSR Council of Ministers.

V.I. Vorotnikov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the RSFSR Council of Ministers; N.N. Slyunkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; and N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, took part in the work of the USSR Council of Ministers session.

The session was addressed by N.I. Ryzhkov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

More on TV Screening of Movie 'Risk'

Director Interviewed

PM261621 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 25 Oct 87 p 4

[Interview with film director Dmitriy Barshchevskiy by Yu. Likhachev under the headline "That Was How It Was..."—date and place unspecified, first three paragraphs are editorial and Likhachev introduction]

[Text] Unknown aspects of well-known events—that could summarize the content of the documentary feature film "*Risk*." It premieres tomorrow on Central TV Channel 1.

The movie lasts exactly 90 minutes. But the events compressed within it are so important, the facts so unique, and the problems so honest that you watch the movie with bated breath. "Unknown aspects of well-known events"—the notes to the picture state. Its central subject is rockets and its characters are people associated with them: E. Tsiolkovskiy, S. Korolev, W. von Braun, Yu. Gagarin, J. Stalin, M. Tukhachevskiy, W. Churchill, D. Eisenhower, N. Khrushchev, J. Kennedy... Its events are Hiroshima and Potsdam, the Caribbean nightmare and Stalin's funeral, the first spaceflight and a UN General Assembly session. Happy and tragic pages in our history are there—the exultant faces of'61, Korolev's emaciated face after his imprisonment, a blank TV screen and the voice-over reading out the names of those who were shot...

After a screening of the movie organized for journalists by the USSR State Committee for Cinematography, I met with Dmitriy Barshchevskiy, the director of the picture, which was shot at the Gorkiy Film Studios:

[Likhachev] Dmitriy Yuryevich, how and when did the desire to make this film arise?

[Barshchevskiy] Late in the evening on 12 October last year.

[Likhachev] What happened that night?

[Barshchevskiy] They were relaying Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev's press conference from Reykjavik. The tension was conveyed too. I was making a completely different picture at the time, but this press conference shook me and I dropped everything.

[Likhachev] You are better-known as the director of feature films—"The Life and Love of Aleksandr Blok," "Two Chapters from a Family Chronicle"...

[Barshchevskiy] There were years when there was no point making documentaries. But it is impossible not to do so today. Whatever imaginary subject you choose, reality today is always brighter and more unexpected.

[Likhachev] Who wrote the screenplay?

[Barshchevskiy] There wasn't one. But I had a clear idea of the movie because I had studied under Karmen, I was cameraman on several documentaries, and I'm pretty well acquainted with archives both here and in America.

The first thing I did was to meet with friends of Sergey Pavlovich Korolev... I was greatly helped by *Komsomolskaya Pravda*—the pilot Devyatayev who was downed by a Heinkel-111 as you described, was imprisoned at von Braun's rocket center. The pilot was later found by Korolev and at his suggestion was awarded the title of Hero of the Soviet Union.

[Likhachev] Is there a lot of unique footage in the movie?

[Barshchevskiy] I'm a director of features and I find documentary material in places where documentary makers stop shooting—in snatches and snippets. The main thing is not uniqueness but the secret thread running through the subject: Footage that you have already seen can shock if it is accompanied by the right text at the right place.

Somebody great once said: "Film is the truth 24 times a second."

[Likhachev] Your movie presents a very tough picture of Stalin's personality cult and its consequences...

[Barshchevskiy] History should have nothing cut out. We have things to be proud of even during that fateful period, but there were other things that must never be repeated. Stalin did not believe in rockets or in those who made them. Korolev spent a year in prison, a year at Kolyma, and 6 years working under Tupolev in a special design bureau for prisoners. Who knows what would have become of him had he not been a department chief at the time... In 1953 Sergey Pavlovich entered the party, then became a corresponding member of the Academy of Sciences, and was rehabilitated in 1956...

But even before the 20th Party Congress voices had been raised in defense of innocent convicts. The civic courage of V. Grizodubova and M. Gromov changed the fate of the future chief designer.

[Likhachev] The film's commentary is highly charged with ideas and emotions. Who wrote it?

[Barshchevskiy] The dramatist Natalya Violina, my long-standing collaborator.

[Likhachev] Your film has been made in association with foreign movie companies. What reaction have you had from your partners—have any of them seen the movie?

[Barshchevskiy] None as yet, but, strangely enough, we have been inundated with telexes—people are inquiring about the movie, they want to buy it and screen it. I think that the desire of the Americans, for instance, is linked with the forthcoming summit between M.S. Gorbachev and R. Reagan.

[Likhachev] Did you set yourself any task in making the movie?

[Barshchevskiy] Yes. Helping people to live.

'Truth' about Stalin Noted

LD271207 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1630 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Documentary "Risk" produced by A. Kulidzhanov and directed by Dimitriy Barshchevskiy; with text by N. Violinoy read by I. Kostolevskiy]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted: postwar history of the atom-bomb, McCarthyism in United States] July in Moscow. At Tushino Airport a parade in honor of Air Force Day. Everything is ready. They are just waiting for the arrival of Generallissimo Stalin. [video shows Tushino and Stalin's arrival] Stalin always came to this parade. He likes the little airport on the outskirts of Moscow. He likes the July heat. He likes the rejoicing of the crowd at the foot of the modest rostrum. [video shows Stalin being greeted enthusiastically by the crowd] He sees a sea of heads. He likes it when there are a lot of people; a lot means the masses. Doubts start when it is divided into individuals. That is why Stalin always visits festivities where there are throngs of people.[video shows air parade including plane carrying portrait of Stalin on banner]

It was always like that. But today, even here, there is something hindering the former untroubled feeling. Something is spoiling the joy; something is smarting. On this day he is especially gloomy. Perhaps he has a premonition that this summer is his last? No, hardly. He cannot stand mysticism and any sort of premonitions or predictions. No, no. It is something else. [video shows top brass saluting, while Stalin stands by]

The aircraft, his pride and joy; the embodiment of strength and power. It is these that are deceiving his hopes. There are aircraft, and there are even the bombs, but where can the aircraft deliver them? He is worried by the United States. It has surrounded the USSR with a ring of military bases. How could he have been mistaken then? He had brushed it aside with irritation, had not seen the prospects, had not looked ahead. [video shows more scenes of Stalin at the parade]

Stalin recognizes that it is his mistake. But he cannot bear a feeling of guilt and in order to rid himself of it, other guilty parties must be found. There they are, the guilty parties; Klimov, Migulin, and Yakovlev [video shows the three men] they all say different things; all of them say their own thing. Stalin feels easier: the reasons for the mistake have been found. However, the time has been forever lost. [video shows Stalin on the rostrum at the Tushino parade] [passage omitted]

Rockets appeared to be a bagatelle, a plaything for the scientists. Few people saw a future for them. Among those few was Marshal Tukhachevskiy. In essence he was the first state figure to believe in rockets. It was he who was the organizer of the rocketry research institute in which the unforgettable Katyusha was dreamed up. [video shows Tukhachevskiy addressing a meeting on the importance of rockets, attended by Stalin; the audience, apart from Stalin, is shown applauding] [passage omitted: more on history of rocketry in both countries from the war onward]

7 Novermber 1952. This parade, the next one after the one at Tushino, was also the last one in Stalin's life. All happy events have always made haste toward holidays. It was today that Stalin was told of the successes with rockets. Stalin does not react in any way. He always needed time to think. He knows that he will return to it himself. He listens to Red Square. The crowd is rejoicing in just the same way; the bands are playing in just the same way. He has always loved this. But with the passing years even more so. He is finding it harder and harder to cope with solitude. For this reason the parades are becoming more and more grandiose. [video shows Stalin at the November parade, cheering crowds, panning shot of leadership along mausoleum, showing Stalin, Budennyy, Beria Khrushchev, Mikoyan, Milotov, and other unidentfied leaders]

Today, 7 November, is a sacred day. He recalls the holiday in previous years. 1941 is specially clear, when the Germans were at the gates of Moscow. He alone knows what that parade cost him. He alone knows what it felt like. He went out on to the rostrum and raised his hand. The country saw him at his habitual place, and the echo of belief swept along all fronts. The soldiers of '41 paid him with their lives for that day. Unthinking, they threw themselves under the tracks of the tanks, into the fire into hell, shouting: for Stalin, and they did not regret a thing. The soldiers of '41—they defended Moscow, the world, and our lives. May their names remain sacred. They died without knowing why there was a lack of officers at the front, where our tanks and aircraft were, and why the long-ago-invented Katyushas started to be made only in Moscow's very gravest days. They did not find out the truth. But the truth was that Tukhachevskiy had believed in the Katyusha rockets. Tukhachevskiy had been declared by Stalin to be an enemy of the people.

After Tukhachevskiy, Korolev was also drawn into that funnel. Stalin remembered the morning's report: rockets, Korolev. Stalin had spoken to Korolev at one time; Stalin remembered him well and did not like him. Korolev had a strong and powerful personality. Stalin did not like people like that. He thought that only one person should be strong. He knows that these people link all their achievements with his name. It was they who built the magnitka and the metro—but they said, not us, but Stalin. They got to Berlin, for Stalin. And now today, they are creating rockets, but they are saying Stalin. They are dreaming of happiness for their children, and they say Stalin. Always and everywhere. [video shows military parade archive footage, including large portrait of Stalin, slogan saying: Glory to Stalin, crowds cheering and waving]. Everything was shattered in one instant on 5 March 1953. Time was split into two: With him and without him. In this new time we still had to learn to live. The air of those days was teeped in grief, despair, and

confusion. All are gripped by un unspoken question: What lies ahead, what will happen? On that day it seemed that never again would it be possible to smile and look at the world with a clear gaze. There is howling ahead. Universal sorrow. Everyone is in its grip, even the strongest, the ones who have suffered most. Even Korolev. He is not here. On that day he was in Kapustin Yar. On the pages of his diary there is confusion and alarm. Time had stopped. It was a shock, but none of these people knows the truth. The 20th Party Congress is still to come. Only then will they find out the truth about him. It will be like a bolt of lightning. But afterward, it will become easier to breathe. It will be a desperately bold step. It will be a risk. But every step toward the truth is always a risk, always brave. [video shows people filing in to pay their last respects to Stalin, scenes show men and women weeping, filing past the bier] [passage omitted: work on missiles proceeds in the United States]

According to intelligence reports, the Russians are building something huge in Kazakhstan. It looks like a cosmodrome. Not everything is going smoothly at Baykonur. [video shows rocket disintegrating after lift-off] There, too, there are failures. [passage omitted on first sputnik].

A month after the first sputnik was launched, the 40th GOSR anniversary Red Square parade took place, with the first intercontinental ballstic missile. [video shows ICBM's at parade] It is 8 years since our first atomic bomb and 4 since our first hydrogen bomb. Now we not only have bombs, but delivery vehicles as well. [further shots of missiles during parade]

After the war we went short of food and sleep; we turned soldiers' overcoats into women's coats—but we invested billions in rockets [rakety]. Foreign correspondents are interested: Why does your most peace-loving country need such powerful arms? We reply: We are not just the most peace-loving, but also now the strongest. It is more our strong position that we offer peace. We do not ask for mercy, but we extend our hands in friendship. [passage omitted: Khrushchev at the UN in 1959; Power's Moscow trial]

The pilot Powers does not consider himself personal enemy of the Russian people. But is General Eisenhower, our combat ally during the war who lived to see Victory Day together with us—is he an enemy of the Russian people? President Eisenhower is not the enemy either. No one is, as an individual. But take them all together and you get the Cold War. The peace conference of heads of states, with which so many hopes were linked, has been wrecked. This is the price of that day in May. [video shows Eisenhower]. [passage omitted on Khrushchev-Kennedy Vienna Summit; Gagarin's flight; Cuban missile crisis]

A quarter of a century has elapsed since. The world has not laid down its arms. The risk has not lessened. Life has become even more dangerous. They had their Challenger, we had our Chernobyl. Both were on earth, under one sky. There is no way back. There is a road to meet each other.

IZVESTIYA Chief's Warning on Restructuring

LD271220 Hamburg DPA in German 1139 GMT 27 Oct 87

[Text] Trier (DPA)—Ivan D. Laptev, editor-in-chief of the Soviet Government paper *Izvestiya* has warned against idealizing the social restructuring process in the USSR. Addressing members of the Karl Marx Society in Trier on Monday evening, Laptev said that the Soviet Union representation of itself "as a monolithic homogenous society" had been a serious "recent propaganda mistake". Such "gushing" was unable to solve the nationality problem in the USSR.

The *Izvestiya* editor-in-chief also admitted mistakes by the state bureaucracy in dealing with privately organized pressure groups. "We still have not learned to deal with private initiatives; however, we have learned that we cannot simply get rid of them", Laptev said. According to Laptev, Soviet reformers could face a "critical situation at this difficult period" if the planned 40 percent reduction of the "overblown administrative apparatus" is shortly embarked upon. Considerable resistance could be expected from sections of the 16 million employed there at present, the journalist feared.

GOSR Center Opens; Gorbachev To Speak 2 Nov

LD261135 Moscow TASS in English 1119 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 (TASS)—Five thousand eight hundred people will take part in a two-day session in the Kremlin to mark the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution, a high-ranking official of the CPSU Central Committee told the first news conference at the special press centre to cover the celebrations.

Nikolay Shishlin, head of the press centre, said that besides members of elected leading party bodies and deputies of the supreme soviets (parliaments) of the USSR and the Russian Federation, 1,000 front-rank workers, 300 old revolutionaries and 900 foreign guests had been invited to attend the session.

Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, will deliver a report on the first day of the session, November 2, at 10 a.m.

The meeting of representatives of communist, socialist, social democratic, workers', labour, revolutionary democratic and national liberation parties and organizations on November 4-5 would be of an informal character, Shishlin said.

The CPSU suggested that the meeting be held as free discussion without a preset agenda and lengthy speeches.

Delegations from 13 socialist countries, 30 ruling parties of developing nations, more than 80 communist and workers' parties, more than 30 socialist, social democratic and labour parties, about 15 delegations from revolutionary democratic organizations are expected to come to Moscow.

Besides, representatives of the Indian National Congress, the Centre Party of Finland, the Greens party of the Federal Republic of Germany and some other parties have been invited to attend the festivities.

"In holding the meeting, we proceed from the premise that emphasis on independence and responsibility of each party and every movement is necessary," Shishlin said.

Asked whether a Chinese Communist Party delegation would take part in the session, the head of the press centre said that the CPSU explored the possibility of the arrival to Moscow of a representative of the world's biggest communist party.

The Communist Party of China is now having its 13th congress. So far it seems that Chinese Communists are not prepared for participation in the celebrations in Moscow.

During the work of the press centre, Soviet and foreign journalists will have a chance to meet with senior party officials, leading scientists and workers of culture.

A press conference on the subject of the CPSU's economic and social policy will be held tomorrow. Speakers include Academicians Abel Aganbegyan and Tatyana Zaslavskaya.

Press conferences on subjects of Soviet science, culture, problems of expanding democracy in the Soviet Union and the CPSU's internationalist policy will also be held.

New Issue of KOMMUNIST Viewed

PM261523 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 15 Oct 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Journal's Latest Issue"]

[Text] The latest, fifteenth issue of the journal *Kommunist* opens with an editorial under the heading "Vocation of Socialist Culture." The Leninist principles of the party's work with cultural figures, of the tradition of democratism and respect for talent are inseparable from the struggle for the truth of the revolution and the role of these traditions in the present restructuring—this is the leading idea of the article.

In the issue an account is given of the CPSU Central Committee resolutions on urgent measures to accelerate the solution of the food question, on additional measures to develop personal subsidiary plots and collective horticulture and truck farming, and on the further development of enterprises' subsidiary farms.

An article by V. Kamentsev, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, is devoted to the problems and tasks of developing the USSR's foreign economic ties. In an article by the economists V. Ivanter, Yu. Leybkind and V. Perlamutrov, the state of the country's money circulation is subjected to critical analysis, and the economic significance of finance and credit reform is stressed.

Under the heading "Democracy and Competence" a conversation with G. Tovstonogov, artistic director of the Leningrad M. Gorkiy Bolshoy Dramatic Theater, is published.

"The October Revolution and the Revolution in Vietnam" is the title of an article by Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee. Under the title "October in the Peoples' Destiny" the replies of prominent figures in communist and workers' parties to questions from a correspondent of the journal are published. An article by N. Maslov on the theoretical preparation of the revolution is devoted to the 70th anniversary of Great October.

The discussion section of the journal contains replies by legal specialists S. Alekseyev and S. Shirinskiy to questions from the journal's editorial staff on current problems in juridical science and practice, and on the role of the law in the restructuring process. Urgent tasks in pedagogical science are examined in an article by V. Kuramin "Pedagogy: The Necessity for Change." An article by P. Dolgorukov is published on the problems and peculiarities of the Japanese economy. In a review of readers' letters a wide range of opinions is shown on questions to improve the mechanism of distribution and of strengthening social justice.

Other items are also published in the issue.

Pre-Anniversary Press 'Looks Matter-of-Fact'

LD261525 Moscow TASS in English 1409 GMT 26 Oct 87

[Text] Moscow October 26 (TASS)—TASS commentator Boris Prokhorov writes:

Comparing newspapers for the past few days, a fortnight or so before the 1917 revolution anniversary festivities, with those printed at the same time three, four and five years ago reveals a striking contrast.

Set besides the former trumpteing reports about labour feats (did all of them really occur?), today's press looks matter-of-fact and businesslike.

It features indepth critical articles and stories on measures taken in the name of perestroika and in popular interests, as well as news about achievements dedicated to the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution.

But the previous florid, empty rhetoric is gone, or almost so.

The papers, in the meantime, do not exist in a void. They reflect life. And once the press has changed, this means that life has, too.

It is a sign of the times that, with as many as more than ten days yet to go before the anniversary celebrations, farmers in the Moscow region are reported to have already met their promise to reach their output targets for the year by November 7.

Despite most adverse weather in the past summer and fall, they have been able to take in an average of over 36 centers of grain from every hectare of land, collecting almost 50 % more grain than planned.

The good news, however, has been printed alongside a statistical survey which reported some industries performing markedly below par.

It has been a sad piece to read shortly before a holiday, but truth is truth.

Not everyone, however, is prepared to admit this, and relapses into the old habit of delivering glowing "anniversary reports" still are to be encountered.

In Uzbekistan, for example, they have publicly promised not to enlist school-children in the cotton-harvesting effort this time, but have still made them go to the fields instead of classes, or otherwise a glossy we've-done-it report would not be possible on time.

In Moscow, metro builders have for the same reason decided to declare an unfinished subway line open in time for the anniversary.

Neither trick has worked, however, as the press and television have exposed the blazon lovers in both cases. This is a sign of the times as well.

Quite a few important government decisions have been made public these days, including those to make research institutions fully self-supported in financial terms, to allow trading cooperatives that will sell goods for prdocution co-ops, and to extend paid leave to attend a sick child to 14 from seven days.

These decisions are another sign of the times: Over the years there have piled up a multitude of matters to be resolved.

Ahead of the 70th anniversary of the October Revolution, the country is working hard. The approaching jubilee is certainly making itself felt, but not through big-sounding words or the beat of the drum.

A businesslike atmosphere, awareness of the complexity of the tasks to be tackled, optimism, sober judgements and truth spoken as it is—this is what characterizes these pre-holiday days.

Ulyanovsk Restructuring Conference Held

PM130957 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Oct 87 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Creation for Everyday Restructuring!"]

[Text] Ulyanovsk, 10 Oct—The last 7 decades have been a difficult but truly heroic period in our country's history. The creation of a mighty power where representatives of dozens of nations and ethnic groups live and work was the outstanding result of reordering society on a new, socialist basis. Soviet people are rightly proud of their revolution's achievements. But today compels us to see not only achievements but accumulated problems and to clearly recognize the new demands dictated by life itself. This was the main idea at the scientific and practical conference entitled "Great October and the Problems of Restructuring" held today in Ulyanovsk.

The conference organizers—the USSR Academy of Sciences and Ulyanovsk CPSU Obkom—invited leading scientists from Moscow, Volgograd, Kuybyshev, Penza, Saratov, and Cheboksary to participate in the discussions along with a large detachment of party and soviet activists from the vast Volga region.

A frank and constructive discussion on the paths of restructuring, the accelerated renewal of the economy, and the democratization of all spheres of life was conducted in three thematic sections. The conference adopted extensive specific recommendations on the basis of the results of the discussion.

The plenary sessions were addressed by Academician B.N. Ponomarev of the USSR Academy of Sciences and Yu.g. Samsonov, first secretary of Ulyanovsk CPSU Obkom.

'Increase in Openness' of 1977 Constitution

PM131605 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English No. 40, 4 Oct 87 p 3

[Yevgeniy Ambartsumov "Political Diary" article: "Present Soviet Constitution Is Ten Years Old"]

[Text] Attempts at developing the draft of the fourth Soviet Constitution have been made more than once. Changes in society and problems brewing inside it demanded an overhaul of the country's Fundamental Law. Work on the last Constitution of the country was finished - in a spurt - in 1977.

Naturally, we can see from the height of our present experience that not all the needs of our fast-flowing time have been heeded in its text. We have advanced especially far in the latest years.

Nevertheless, the Constitution remains a significant, progressive and long-lasting document. The reasons for it were the highest degree of professionalism and honesty of the experts preparing the draft, and the political maturity of the Soviet people who took part in the nationwide discussion of it. For example, it was proposed to increase the authority of the commissions of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, as well as the authority of their recommendations. The proposal was accepted and found its expression in Article 125 of the Constitution, in accordance to which an important but practically inexistent earlier aspect of Soviet parliamentarism is developing now.

Many of the ideas of the 1977 Constitution were vastly different from the 1936 Constitution, and it is they that have become the legal basis for prestroyka now. They are: state power exercised by the whole people; the growing role of the collectives; the economic independence of enterprises; the use of self-accounting, profits, production cost and other economic levers and stimuli; the protection of the environment and historical monuments; the possibility for the use of the individual enterprise; legality; the development of socialist democracy; and, particularly, the increase of openness and a constant regard of public opinion.

It is true, when the 1977 Constitution was ratified, the fashion was set by those who attached a purely ritual role to such aspects. It is also true that certain parts of it carry such characteristic signs of that time as the tendency to make pronouncements for effect, ostentation, grandiloquence, and the desire to avoid burning and controversial issues. In actual life, however, the infringements on such recently declared at that time constitutional principles as an inadmissibility of the use of socialist property for personal ends and victimization of people for their criticism, the independence of the court and Procurator's Office, and personal inviolability became numerous.

Times change and we change along with our attitude towards the Constitution: we ever more clearly see it as the Fundamental Law of the country, with which we are to assess our own and others' actions and political acts. Infringements are being blocked, the rights of the individual are supplemented with more reliable guarantees (for example, the passing of a law about the procedure of lodging complaints against officials whose actions infringe on the citizens' rights, which ensured the effectiveness of Article 58 of the Constitution).

Hence, an apparent conclusion that the 1977 Constitution is as a whole more important now than at the moment of its adoption. It is now more credited than before. This is the manifestation of the healing significance of perestroyka as well as the democratic potential of the Fundamental Law. It is so because the degree and the character of the fulfillment of a Constitution depends on the practice and the time when it becomes law.

If the Constitution was, earlier, broader than the practice and reminded one of a dress made too big - to fit later when the owner grows a little, then at present the dress is a tight fit for our society. It should be expected that in the process of perfecting the new economic and political mechanism of any socialist society the question of the further perfecting the Fundamental Law of that country will also arise. [as published] However, haste is inadmissible in such an important matter, and I think that perestroyka will supply us with a mound of new material for thought.

As for now, we will continue to read the Constitution, comply with it, and demand the same from others. We will think how it can be improved, and our ideas about it will come in handy.

Azerbaijani Writer on Glasnost, Nationalism

PM211311 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 Oct 87 p 4

[Interview with Anar Rasulovich Rzayev, first secretary of the Azerbaijan Writers Union Board, by correspondent R. Guseynov under the "Our Spiritual Values" rubric: "The Artist Must Be a Fighter"; date and place of interview unspecified]

[Text] Allow me to introduce my interlocutor: Anar (Anar Rasulovich Rzayev) is an Azerbaijani Soviet writer, dramatist, and screenwriter. Anar's books have been translated into many languages of the USSR's peoples and published in a number of foreign countries.

In June 1987 Anar was elected first secretary of the Azerbaijan Writers Union Board.

[Guseynov] You have taken the helm of the republic's writers' organization at a difficult time.

Much has changed in the country's spiritual climate. I have no doubt that these changes are irreversible. But there is another factor which cannot be overlooked. Considerable numbers of people are slowing down progress by merely waiting for things to happen. Afraid of getting in the way, they do not want to help, either, and people have already been disillusioned. After all, you cannot expect to wake up one morning and find that society is renewed. Yet there have been people like that.

How do you see the role of writers in the difficult processes which are taking in society? In your view, what changes should be made to the activity of the Azerbaijan Writers' Union

[Rzayev] All the changes in society take place through man, and man is the subject of literature. I should like to clarify that idea, I think it is important. To change society it is necessary for man to change first.

Literature deals primarily with universal human values. Life, death, solitude, struggle, betrayal, courage, good, and evil—eternal themes which some critics sometimes cannot help calling "abstract." But betrayal cannot be abstract—it can involve a man's death. Evil must not triumph with impunity because triumphant evil leaves behind it thousands of seared souls, indifference, opportunism, and cowardice.

You are probably wondering how it could be that we surrendered such concepts as "suffering" and "charity" entirely to religion. After all, without these qualities the fully developed human personality cannot exist at all, and that applies to Soviet man as the man of the new society.

Thus it is the case that we have tried to transform Marxism-Leninism—the greatest and most specific teaching in mankind's history—into what is almost a religious concept.

After all, as far as religion is concerned, human life has no value in itself. It is a step, a stage on the way to heavenly rewards and happiness. Strange as it may seem, there have been attempts to introduce this notion into our ideology. It is said that the life of present generations is merely a means to attain the juster society of the future.

You will recall Nikolay Ostrovskiy's noteworthy comment that we are given but one life and it must be lived worthily. I have heard various interpretations of those words. Some people preferred the cynical interpretation: "We have but one life, et apres nous le deluge." That is unacceptable to us. But it is also difficult to accept the other interpretation: "You have but one life and you must sacrifice it to ensure the happy life of your great grandchildren." The life of an entire generation must not be negated as having no value of its own. In this connection I should like to take up the following problem: the attitude toward Lenin's theoretical legacy. Vladimir Ilich's words to the delegates to the Third Russian Communist Youth Union Congress are well known: "You can only be a Communist when you have enriched your mind with a knowledge of the wealth of man's creation." For some reason we have applied these words only to the past. Yet indefatigable human reason is creating that wealth in our day, too. Why do we treat it with greater caution?

Let me be specific. In the twenties our country, although half-starved and surrounded by enemies, did not fear ideological works which were overtly hostile to us. Books by Nietzsche, Spengler, Schopenhauer, and Freud. Their books were printed because we were sure of the strength of our convictions and our ideology. Opposing ideas did not seem so terrible to us. Later this spiritual fervor began to subside. Criticized names continued to be mentioned, they were routed, but new readers learned of our ideological opponents' philosophical and ethical views only through... quotations. We even reached the point of renouncing Yesenin and Dostoyevskiy. Not to mention the fact that the brilliant theoretical work of Lenin himself did not reach us in its full form. The result of this was a definite spiritual impoverishment.

Here is another example closer to present-day reality. During debates with our literary opponents and sometimes even our friends in Western countries in the sixties we often heard it said: "If you are so democratic, why do you not publish Kafka, for example?" Eventually Kafka was published. What did that change? We came to know another interesting writer. He did not shake the foundations of our society and won a quite narrow range of admirers.

This atmosphere did not promote the success of our ideological work. In recent years it has reminded me of a boxer training with a punching bag. As he relentlessly pounds the inanimate object he is well aware of the reaction he will get. But when faced with a real opponent whose reactions are unpredictable, he may well throw in the towel. The ideological skirmish is somewhat fiercer than mere fisticuffs.

[Guseynov] The times have changed now, and I would like your opinion on the writer's role and potential for influencing the processes actively taking place in society. Especially as you can now speak not only as a writer, dramatist, and journalist but also as leader of a writers' organization.

[Rzayev] A writers' organization, of course, stimulates literary life to some extent, it organizes it. But by itself it cannot change that life. A writers' organization is only as effective as literature itself.

Back in the sixties our literature boasted some excellent names well known in the country. A number of writers, when the period of stagnation was at its worst, wrote the truth about the life of their people and republic and did not gloss over the problems at all.

I find it hard to remember a literary work "banned" in the republic during those years. At the recent all-union writers congress, when we had listened to speeches by writers from various republics who talked bitterly about their misfortunes, the high-ranking person sitting next to me in the hall turned to me and said: "Look at that, yet we banned nothing in our republic." I could not help replying with a joke, saying that this demonstrates one of two things: either the authorities were democratic enough or our literature was so impotent that it could offend no one. However, the truth seems to me to lie

somewhere in between. Honest books by Isa Guseynov, Chingiz Guseynov, Maksud and Rustam Ibragimbekov, Akram Aylisli, Elchin, Yusif Samedogly, and Sabir Akhmedov were published.

What is the importance and place in our literature of the writers I have named? The generation of the sixties, to which I too belong, entered literature after the 20th party congress. "Thick" journals were the hallmark of the time. New works of prose, poetry, and criticism were literally snatched out of your hands. Is that not similar to what is happening today? Alas, Nikita Sergeyevich Khrushchev, who did so much to eliminate the consequences of the personality cult, who restored fathers and children to many families and restored their good names to those who had died (this must also be remembered and mentioned—this is the historical truth), he too, after the regrettable meeting and conversations with the creative intelligentsia in the Manezh, launched into groundless criticism of them. It was then that the forward movement began to slow down. No, it did not go into reverse or stop (that was already impossible), but it did slow down. Then, too, many writers began holding back their work for publication at a later date.

I have deviated somewhat from our question and, returning now to the writers' organization and its role in society's life, I should like to say the following. Literature exists independently of the writers' organization and the honest writer will write the truth regardless of the union. His talent cannot be organized by any union. But the Writer Union can and must help young talents which have yet to establish themselves or win recognition. Furthermore, not every writer is a fighter. And, who knows, perhaps another dozen could have been added to the list that I gave before had they not given up prematurely.

In my view, another important task facing the union is to direct the writers' organization toward the topical problems of the day. I would very much like writers in their creative work not to withdraw into their ivory tower or retire to their dachas in Peredelkino but to become actively involved in life. I believe that we can learn much here from Russian writers' remarkable, selfless activity in defense of Lake Baykal and against the plan to divert the northern rivers. After all, we, too, have our problems here: the problem of the Caspian, the republic's environment, the preservation of monuments, the rational use of oil, and cotton growing.

[Guseynov] Never before have writers' words been so closely linked with urgent economic and agricultural problems. In fact the voice of the most principled cultural figures did ring out before, but it was bitter with frustration. That voice has changed now: It has become confident. There has also been a change in the voices of those functionaries who placed the "interests of the economy" above all else, forgetting in the process that the economy means first and foremost people, not machines. And people cannot live without the green forest and grass around them, clean water, and birds. I recall the well made U.S. movie "Soylent Green." It showed a city of the future—a monstrous megalopolis absolutely alien to human nature. Overpopulated, with a level of pollution which had reached the limit and monotonous synthetic food. And the great boon of civilization was voluntary painless death. Just a few moments before the consciousness of the doomed man is snuffed out forever, when he no longer has the time to tell anyone about it, he is shown how the earth used to be. A stunningly blue sky with white clouds, the splash of a limpid stream, a glowing sun over the horizon of the sea, a gracious deer looking with a startled gaze from the screen, an endearing crane, a sunny glade, and a giant centuries-old sequoia. The comparison between the two worlds—the one that used to be and the one that has been handed down—cannot fail to strike or shock the viewer.

Of course, if he wants to, the modern city dweller can still find for himself a small corner of nature, but sober-minded people began sounding the alarm long ago. Here is something which has impressed me on this visit to Baku. On the one hand the Law on Individual Labor Activity is working actively, and that is an undoubted benefit. On the other hand, it was distressing to observe the tragedies (no other word will do here) unfolding before my eyes in the settlement of Novkhany on the very shores of the Caspian. In many yards they were calmly chopping down fig and mulberry trees, uprooting vines, and clearing the ground for greenhouses. A profitable business, of course, prosperity should be increased, and it is far easier to cultivate tomato seedlings than to tend vines. But it took incredibly hard work (as everyone knows) to plant and cultivate these trees on the grim soil of the Apsheron peninsula, where every drop of water is of the greatest value. The oldsters are aware of that fact and repeatedly stood in the way of the axes. Unfortunately, the profit motive proved stronger. But how will he feel tomorrow, this man with the latest Zhiguli in front of his house and a pile of tomatoes on his table? You, as a writer, must surely be concerned not only about his material well-being but also his spiritual outlook.

[Rzayev] The spiritual and cultural environments are closely and inextricably linked. Civilization and technical progress advance, of course, and it would be odd to impede or oppose this movement. But this advance must not be blind or chaotic. It is man's role as creator and constructor to ensure that everything tallies and balances.

I want to talk about one further problem which, in my view, is covered one-sidedly. Our writers have written numerous times about the sad fate of the forests that are being systematically cut down to make room for new cotton plantations. But one must be completely frank here. Quite a lot is being said now (and quite rightly so) about the impermissibility of such a policy, the monstrous practice whereby the land is nourished with more

toxic chemicals than water and loving care. But why is nothing said at the same time about the fact that nothing is being done to reduce cotton procurement targets.

Please understand me correctly, I am not defending leaders who have opted for the method of overreporting as a means of self-preservation and often of winning plaudits. But what about dealing with those who are well aware of the yield limits and potential of a particular farm? They are the ones who systematically issue unrealistic targets which push people inevitably into the situation of overreporting and law-breaking year after year. And then you can begin judging the direct perpetrators.

Damage both environmental and spiritual is the result of this dual morality: Young people's minds are warped and they become cynical.

[Guseynov] I would like to touch on another problem in my conversation with you. The alarming events of last year in Alma-ata forced us to look closely at what we call nationalism.

How could some Soviet people, albeit just a few, raised since the October Revolution have been in thrall to this antiquated phenomenon? Why did young people figure among them?

It is possible, of course, to blame the years of stagnation for everything, but that would only represent part of the truth.

In my view, it occurred because Leninist principles of internationalism were forgotten, because of a desire to hide inability behind a screen of ostentatious measures and a reluctance to engage in painstaking daily work.

At first glance it may seem odd even to ask whether it is necessary to foster friendship among the peoples. Some people will say that we have built up considerable forms and methods of international education. All this is true, and such forms probably did work at one stage. Today, however, some of them are quite clearly not bringing any benefit and consequently are doing harm.

[Rzayev] National relations in our country are important in themselves. They are no less important in their international aspect. I would like to explain this idea. Not only because people abroad pass judgment on the way we handle our relations but primarily because the USSR is a unique example of a multinational state based not on the idea of empire but on the principle of a union of peoples enjoying equal rights. And if mankind is to survive in the nuclear age (I am convinced of this), its future lies in such an equal union.

So why did the problems about which we have been speaking come as a surprise for many people? Here we must again return to the point where we began: to the lack of glasnost and pomp and ceremony. In national relations we quite often replaced the truth with an idyll.

Let us take an important and very delicate question in national relations such as linguistic equality, which is, moreover, enshrined in the constitution. Be that as it may, the truth is that due attention has not always been paid to national languages.

I appreciate and sympathize with the distress and alarm felt by my Russian fellow writers who campaign for the purity, preservation, and clarity of their language. But the concern of national writers, who are no less sensitive, must also be appreciated. After all, literature in these languages and its terminology and sphere of use are much more restricted. This also explains the alarm felt by national intelligentsias concerning the fate of their languages.

That is why (and it is a principle of mine about which I will speak tirelessly) we must concern ourselves with both things. It is essential that Russian be studied in a serious, responsible, and careful way in the national republics. However, the national language must also be seriously studied by everyone who lives for long in those republics or who is a native inhabitant of them.

A person without a good command of Russian today is a blind man incapable of understanding a thousandth part of the riches accumulated by mankind. He deliberately narrows his horizon and limits his knowledge and access to world culture. There is no need to fear grand statements: A knowledge of Russian is a question of the survival of our nation as a cultured nation rich in up-to-date knowledge and armed with all the achievements of civilization. On the other hand, the preservation of one's own language is very important for any nation.

I find it both sad and ludicrous when I hear or sometimes even read the boastful thoughts of some writers about the preeminence of particular cultures. Sad because the bacilli of nationalism in our literary work are capable of destroying the talent of any great figure. Ludicrous because any national literature deprived of the influence of other cultures is shut up within itself like a clam and becomes ineluctably impoverished.

And here I find myself inevitably thinking of the life of one man. Sabukhi—meaning Man of the Morning, the poetic pseudonym chosen by Mirza Fatali Akhundov—was a great Azerbaijani playwright, philosopher, educator, and democrat who fought all his life against the impenetrable darkness of the Eastern feudal night.

The profound, devout, and active love of the great internationalist and herald of friendship among the peoples Mirza Fatali Akhundov for his own people and other peoples is for me an instructive example both as citizen and writer.

And one more lesson given by Akhundov. If literature is to attain its goals it must not preach by means of abstract truths but must expose and criticize specific vices of modern reality and assert vital ideas that guide people's thinking and will along the path of progress. The charge was leveled against Mirza Fatali that his works, which castigated backward morals, could create an unattractive impression of our nation as a whole. (This absurd charge has, alas, proven historically very tenacious and has been leveled at other artists at different times and in different countries.) Flatly rejecting such charges, Akhundov wrote as follows: "It is my conviction that the creation of such works is not a sign of my lack of love for my own people... It is well known that every people have rogues, scoundrels, and fools. The life and behavior of such people is mocked in dramatic art so as to serve as a lesson to others."

How relevant that sounds today.

Need To Combat Bureaucracy Cited

PM221001 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Oct 87 Second Edition p 1

[Editorial: "Geared to Results; Eradicating the Administrative Edict and Bureaucratic Style of Party Leadership"]

[Text]The changes currently taking place in the country clearly show that restructuring is encompassing more and more of the various aspects of our life. There is indisputable positive progress not only in people's awareness of the tasks of restructuring but in practical approaches. Working people firmly advocate the immediate resolution of urgent problems.

The economy is the main field for restructuring. A radical reform of the economic mechanism is under way and the social program is being carried out more actively. Socialist democracy is being deepened and expanded. These are the main strategic tasks. But it is also necessary to solve tasks directly affecting the people's prosperity. It is a question of supplying the population with food, housing, high-quality consumer goods, and exemplary medical services. Party committees and primary party organizations are in the key avenues of the work that has been launched. It is already hard for some people to keep quiet or sit quietly by, since the quality of results depends on collectives as a whole and each worker in particular. Economic accountability [khozraschet], self-financing, and self-capitalization are putting production into a position where unconscientious and irresponsible attitudes to work are impermissible.

The stage has begun when everything planned in recent years must be implemented. The decisions that have been taken must be followed up by practical work. Under these conditions new forms and methods of party work are needed centering on specific people and their specific concerns. How do we explain the fact that initiative and creativity are often hamstrung? Why do disparities emerge between the growing activeness of the masses on the one hand and the still common bureaucratic style of activity and attempts to stifle restructuring on the other? The answer was supplied at the Central Committee June Plenum: Our progress is being hampered by administrative edict forms of running society. Democratic and economic methods could considerably accelerate that progress.

Party committees where one senses the spirit of restructuring not in words but in deeds are typified by original approaches to problem-solving and an ability to act in the new way. It is from this standpoint that the abilities and actions of each worker in the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee, for instance, are assessed. They use forms of developing cadre activeness such as job certification. This takes account of many qualities—intolerance of shortcomings, routine, and complacency; in-depth knowledge of economics; and an ability to lead by personal example. The decisive criterion is the attitude to restructuring and the ability to reinforce words with deeds every day.

Only by throwing oneself into the hurly-burly of life and working among people and with people is it possible to tangibly influence the results of economic activity. This style should be asserted everywhere and close feedback organized. However, influence does not mean supplanting. It is time to resolutely stop those who continue to interfere in details of the work of enterprises, farms, and associations. Even today unconditional commands that drive firms into a thicket of regulations and restrictions or simply force them to do "as ordered" can still be heard.

Restructuring in party work is not proceeding without mistakes and failures. Sometimes people seem to eschew obsolete forms but do not know how to act differently. As a result formalism appears once again. For instance, in Ternopol Oblast workers at the Kozovskiy party raykom visited certain farms 15 times each in 5 months. Others hardly received two visits each. Yet these "others" were precisely the laggard collectives which particularly need help. The essence of field visits often boils down to just passing on higher organs' directives, which again deprives kolkhoz and sovkhoz leaders of independence in developing solutions.

Many *Pravda* readers rightly ask why representatives of party organs visit labor collectives. To note shortcomings or to help organize the work? There are no two ways about it—after all, the execution of any adopted decision depends on the effectiveness of work with the masses.

Even the best document will just be an ordinary piece of paper in a loose-leaf folder if it is not backed up by organizational activity and practical action.

The intention to eschew excessive administration does not by itself lead to the desired result. Replacing commands over the phone with personal orders does not mean shifting the center of ideological and educational work to the masses. Modern methods of party leadership should be studied every day and every hour. It is necessary to collect experience from details and develop initiative, independence, and creativity.

The radical reform of economic management does not only concern the "upper echelons." It is linked first and foremost with the initiative of all grassroots links. It is there that vitally important questions are resolved. The first thing that must be done is for everyone to do their job conscientiously, since no one will do it for us, to instill order, and to strengthen discipline and organization. Party committees must be concerned about this, be able to listen to people, and check any resolutions or actions that are taken against their opinions. The enhancement of primary organizations' role is promoted by the extensive development of democratic principles and glasnost. Primary organizations must have more scope for discussing urgent problems, and more potential for ensuring their accelerated resolution.

Bureaucratic methods, when only the illusion of work is created, are resolutely countered by an orientation toward end results. Against the backdrop of the active position of most Soviet people the behavior of those who hamper transformations for selfish gain is particularly unseemly. We must be firm and intolerant of everything that retards acceleration. In this regard cadre selection, placement, and education work needs major improvement. That is the main thing. Cadres do not need to be moved around, just taught new forms of economic management and the present-day style of party leadership. The time when leaders passed the buck, allowing their superiors to sort things out, is over. All these referrals merely justified passivity. The decisions taken by the party will cut the ground from the under the feet of such workers.

We are into the last 3 months of the year. There is still a great deal of urgent work requiring successful completion to be done. The harvest continues in the fields. Crop farmers are working under difficult climatic conditions in their attempts to use every daylight hour and not lose what they have grown. Things are no less busy in industry. There it is necessary to strictly observe delivery discipline and fulfill contractual commitments and annual plans. Since 1 January 60 percent of the country's economy has been switched to the new economic management principles. Already it is necessary to thoroughly prepare to work in the new way. At the same time we must not forget about the approaching winter and ensure that the cold and the frost catch no one by surprise.

Communists are called upon to set an example in all the most important areas. No bureaucratic excuses or dodges should stop them being concerned about ensuring concerted, well organized work which leads to tangible results. Real rather than imaginary progress is the demand of the time. Ensuring that progress and persistently achieving positive changes means promoting restructuring in every possible way.

Latvian Meeting on International Education

PM261417 Riga SOVETSKAYA LATVIYA in Russian 6 Oct 87 pp 1-2

[LATINFORM report: "Without Complacency or Unsystematic Campaigns—That is How Work on International and Patriotic Education Should Be Conducted; Notes From the Riga Party Aktiv Meeting"]

[Text] This aktiv meeting was not planned, as would usually be the case. Life demanded that such an expanded ideological council of Communists be held. Communists, ideological workers, cultural and artistic figures, school teachers, and VUZ and technical college lecturers had in recent years relaxed their struggle against manifestations of nationalism and chauvinism, particularly in the sphere of everyday awareness. Under the conditions of democracy, restructuring, and expanded glasnost adequate measures were not taken to provide a cogent elucidation of historical processes, events, and dates which are still not fully accessible to a wide audience. The city party organization failed to take vigorous steps to resolve the contradictions that built up during the period of stagnation, including in the sphere of national relations.

Indeed, the antisocial and nationalist manifestations that took place in Riga were the result of serious errors and shortcomings in the ideological, moral, international, and patriotic education of the population, particularly young people. Yes, there was not enough vigor, effectiveness, or new approaches in conducting counterpropaganda. Individual preventive work turned out to be poor upon inspection. The mass nature of the hostile propaganda of nationalism from abroad was assessed superficially and without proper attention. Such assessments were also made in the resolution adopted by the Riga party aktiv meeting, which examined the question "On the City Party Organization's Tasks in Further Stepping Up the International Education of the Population and Young People of the City." Secretaries of primary party organizations, the capital's ideological aktiv, and workers from the party gorkom and raykoms were invited to it.

We are learning to live and work under the conditions of expanding glasnost, it is as if we are relearning democracy, the main speaker—A.P. Klautsen, first secretary of Riga party gorkom—noted. But, let us be frank, we still lack adequate political standards and the ability to conduct discussions, to respect other people's views, and to convince opponents with the weight of our arguments.

As M.S. Gorbachev noted: "All peoples have their own languages and history, they want to understand their roots. Does this contradict socialism? Of course not. But, on the other hand, if people turn in on themselves, put on airs, and start presenting this as an absolute value—we cannot agree with that."

Not a single profound and mighty popular movement in history has taken place "without dirty froth," as V.I. Lenin put it. This phenomenon is evident in our country too. The events of 14 June and 23 August at the Freedom Monument must be viewed in dialectical unity with the entire course of restructuring as an attempt to discredit the positive changes in society and to divert our efforts and attention from the resolution of urgent problems. Yes, we are learning democracy, but we will not allow it to become total license, it was stressed from the rostrum. All kinds of extremists who abuse glasnost and democracy present themselves as the vectors of public opinion, protectors of national worth, and even—in the spirit of the times—fighters for restructuring, resorting to the most unbridled demagoguery and persecution of those who disagree with them, sowing division between "their own people" and "foreigners" along national lines.

But there is another category of people who are simply dissatisfied—often justifiably—with the resolution of urgent everyday problems and existing shortcomings in the distribution of housing and social welfare. The natural question arises: Do these people not want to recognize that restructuring is aimed precisely at restoring social justice and achieving prosperity for the people, or are we, in our enthusiasm for criticizing shortcomings and reproaching ourselves in propaganda work, failing to convincingly get the message across about our goals, ideas, and achievements? Clearly the latter assertion is justified.

Ask schoolchildren or students what they understand by restructuring, glasnost, or democracy. Very often you will not get a clear answer, the report at the aktiv meeting stated. What leader of a propaganda and agitation department or party organization secretary will say how many lecturers, propaganda workers, or journalists, for instance, are seriously engaged in explaining the work being done by the party, government, and civic authorities to improve the demographic situation and implement the "Housing," "Population," and "Health" Programs—that is, on questions of vital interest to the people? Do they put in enough work and how effective is it? Let us be honest: There has been no research or analysis on the subject.

But the crux of the problem is not just this alone. The sources of antisocial nationalist manifestations must be sought in the formal attitude of party organizations to international education, the molding of standards of inter-nation contact, and the observance of the principle of bilingualism. This is reaffirmed by the following fact cited at the meeting: Party raykoms and primary party organizations have failed to properly carry out the work to fulfill the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee resolution of 30 December 1986 on stepping up the patriotic and international education of the republic's population. Many party meetings at which this question was discussed were held in a formal fashion not involving specific problems. The measures worked out at them were abstract and failed to take account of the specifics of regions or labor collectives. At certain party organizations the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee resolution was not discussed at all.

Thus in Kirovskiy Rayon meetings of Communists with this agenda were held in just 127 of the 280 primary party organizations. This was the lowest indicator in the city's rayons. Party raykoms have still failed to assess primary party organizations for the serious defects in the international education of taxi workers (party committee secretary V.K. Vasilyeva), the unified control administration for the power systems of the Northwest (A.A. Korolev), the Latvian SSR State Academy Opera and Ballet Theater (O.YU. Shalkonis), the republic Children's Clinical Hospital (S.E. Ostrova), the "Teyka" Furniture Factory (Ye.n. Smirnov), and a number of other collectives whose members were active participants in nationalist actions near the Freedom Monument 23 August.

The shortcomings discussed by Communists from the rostrum of the aktiv meeting are also present in the work of Leningradskiy party raykom. That is why V.YA. Brokan, first secretary of the raykom, devoted a great deal of attention in his speech to a positive program designed to help to eliminate shortcomings. Thus, in particular, it is planned to hold a "roundtable" in October whose participants will be teachers from educational establishments located on the rayon's territory. The raykom's agenda also includes an "ideological day" at an enterprise and lectures for senior students on sociopolitical themes. Another asset is the organization of language courses at work. In general there are many ideas. But the effectiveness of these measures will largely depend on the purposeful work of Communists and their desire and ability not to turn a necessary and useful task into merely another campaign.

The party's course of developing and deepening the processes of democratization has produced a broad upsurge in creative activeness. One of the forms of this activity is represented by amateur or informal associations of working people and youngsters. The absolute majority of people in these associations sincerely strive to help the party solve the tasks of acceleration and restructuring, are genuinely concerned about saving historic and cultural assets and about protecting nature and the environment, and advocate a sober way of life.

At the same time, as was stressed at the aktiv meeting, the activity of some of these associations has begun to be politically colored and even sometimes to oppose the party and Soviet power. A number of party committees

clearly underestimated the political threat posed by the uncontrolled activity of certain independent [samodeyatelnyy] associations and general-interest clubs.

The growth in antisocial trends in such associations is promoted by the passivity, formalism, and routine in the work of the Nature and Monuments Conservation Society and the Voluntary Sobriety Society. These are often out of touch with the masses—particularly young people—in their activities. The societies are predominantly made up of workers of pensionable age who are unable to really organize and involve people.

There are currently more than 400 different clubs and amateur associations operating in the city attached to various organizations, departments, and institutions. And party, trade union, and Komsomol organizations by no means always keep an eye on their activity. That is why the aktiv meeting instructed party organizations to fully display their vanguard role, constantly keep an eye on associations of the aforesaid type, and actively influence their activity, involving them in specific work needed by all society.

The aktiv meeting stressed that under the conditions of expanding democracy the role of the mass media is growing sharply. The responsibility for everything that is said and published is growing, because any mistake, inaccuracy, or distortion of reality will undermine the process of democratization and glasnost. During the discussion it was noted that certain journalists, exploiting the lack of "prohibited" topics and assessing democracy and glasnost as total license, were, very regrettably, carried away with the publication of items providing an inaccurate treatment of the problem of the standard of inter-nation contact and an incorrect interpretation of the social function of languages. A subtle form of nationalism is peddled in certain articles and broadcasts, which sometimes even contain incitement to illegal actions.

The publication of this kind of material is considerably facilitated by the unscrupulous stance of a number of party committees and bureaus, including those of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, the Latvian SSR Writers Union, the weekly *Literatura Un Maksla*, the journal *Avots*, and the newspapers *Padomju Jaunatne* and *Rigas Balss*, which have failed to subject to a proper party assessment the incorrect and frequently harmful stance of the authors of this kind of articles and broadcasts.

The supreme duty of workers in the news media is service to the people. It is necessary to rise above emotions and convenient stereotypes. International and patriotic education is a complex and long-term process. And what is needed here is consistent ideological work rather than ideological crash-programs at the 11th hour. Omissions in the work of the mass media and that of the body of propagandists and lecturers, who are called upon to provide people with regular, high-grade, and reliable information on topical problems, are an important cause of dissatisfaction. This was noted by V.A. Stefanovich, deputy editor of *Sovetskaya Latviya*, and other speakers.

Life has revealed that young people perceive questions of national relations especially acutely. They are sensitive when it comes to any social distortions, negative phenomena, and deformations. However, at times—this too is understandable—they tend to react emotionally rather than rationally. And we must ask ourselves whether young people are always able to find answers to the questions that perturb them. And the answer is: Not always, and not exhaustive answers. And the resulting vacuum is immediately filled by "well-wishers" in Western radio stations and local "champions of national dignity." Therefore the speakers addressing the meeting voiced justified alarm from the rostrum about the poor standard of history, social science, and literature teaching. A purely didactic method of teaching prevails. M.S. Zhigure, a teacher at the Riga No 69 High School, noted that there are few discussion clubs in schools and those that do exist are purely formal, as a rule. There are too few live meetings with people who have lived interesting lives. According to the teacher, it is discussion and lessons in the form of a dialogue which must become the basis of students' political education.

Another problem area is the standard of Russian and Latvian language teaching at educational establishments. Thus in a number of city schools where the language of instruction is Russian, Latvian is not taught at all. At the beginning of the new academic year schools in the Proletarskiy and Moskovskiy rayon were again short of 16 Latvian language teachers. This important aspect of training the necessary cadres was raised in particular by O.D. Potreki, secretary of the P. Stuchka Latvian State University party committee. Special training of Latvian language teachers for schools where the language of instruction is Russian began only during the current academic year.

A great role in the education of the rising generation can and must be played by labor collectives. Unfortunately, open discussions of questions of inter-nation relations in collectives, which would help to provide parents with more precise guidelines, are still rare. And party organizations at parents' workplaces do not always make a principled party assessment of them regarding immature antisocial behavior on the part of their offspring. Most of the commissions which are supposed to provide assistance to families and schools exist only on paper. Courses for parents at enterprises and institutions are not being organized. Yet positive experience which could be utilized does exist. Here is an example cited by S.P. Petrov, secretary of the "Alfa" Production Association party committee. It has become a tradition at the enterprise to hold meetings in labor collectives for parents and children to help young people to adjust to the labor environment. For instance, a young person comes to the plant and sees what prestige his father or mother enjoys among his or her colleagues. The young person

feels proud of his parents and their authority rises in his eyes. Sometimes this even kindles an interest in the job which has earned his parents the recognition they enjoy.

Schools and parents' associations came in for much criticism at the meeting. This is understandable. Most of the people in the hall were parents and this question concerns everyone. Indeed, the fact that teacher collectives and Communist parent councils do not cooperate very effectively with parents has been discussed at length in the press and at various conferences.

Teacher M.S. Zhigure, for instance, focused the attention of those present on the social passiveness of Communist parents. Is it not they who, first and foremost, must subject juvenile antisocial behavior to a principled assessment? However, when the events which took place at the Freedom Monument on 23 August were analyzed at the school, the Communists failed to provide party support for the teacher and stayed on the sidelines. Is it surprising then that many pupils display a passive attitude toward school social life and find "self-expression" elsewhere, outside the home and outside school under the "clever leadership" of other "mentors." Only if parents support teachers verbally and with practical actions will the necessary educational effect be achieved.

The Komsomol is called upon to instill ideological conviction and an active civic stance in young people. These demands are enshrined in the statutes of the all-union youth organization. Yet what do we see in practice? An impartial assessment of the work of the Riga Komsomol organization was given in the report of the first secretary of the party gorkom. Little is being done to enrich the organization's style of work with new forms and methods. Traditional approaches which do not involve all groups of young people predominate in the organization's work. In many primary organizations all educational activity is often reduced to the organization of entertainment events. Clearly, Komsomol gorkom officials did not assist primary organizations enough in preparing and holding meetings on questions of international and patriotic education held, in accordance with the plan, during the first half of the current year. The result is obvious. And how is one to interpret the following fact: Not one senior official of the Komsomol gorkom apparatus took part in the discussions with Komsomol members who had been involved in the events of 23 August. No member of the gorkom group of lecturers delivered a lecture on questions of national relations. Can this, applying a rigorous yardstick, be described as playing a vanguard role in the education of young people?

Hence, the communist assessment that the Komsomol Gorkom Bureau and its First Secretary A.I. Petersons must radically change the style and methods of their work and learn to react promptly and with political assertiveness to all problems which worry young people is correct.

And there is another factor which ought to be mentioned. It is a very alarming factor. Many primary party organizations have reconciled themselves to the fact that economic managers do not personally take part in ideological education work and try to avoid attending integrated political education days. As a rule, the captains of industry have very "weighty" arguments in defense of various conferences and meetings held on precisely that day. And this takes people away from lively conversations with the working people and reduces the effectiveness of such politically important measures.

Many people who spoke at the aktiv meeting raised the problem of the development of bilingualism. This is understandable. Much has been neglected in this sphere. Thus in the organization of Marxist-Leninist education, mass political work, and visual agitation and information, most party organizations fail to take account of the multinational composition of their membership. All the work is conducted mainly in Russian or, on occasion, only in Latvian. This question is especially acute in the service sphere, where no provision has been made for language studies or for encouraging people to study languages.

A situation where only some officials in internal affairs organs speak Latvian can hardly be described as normal either. Quite naturally, this causes familiar difficulties in communications with the indigenous population and acts as an artificial barrier in the establishment of mutual understanding and, at the same time, it is skillfully exploited by our opponents to fuel antagonistic sentiments.

The meeting participants also sharply raised the problem of training propagandists and political information workers to work in Latvian. An urgent task of party organizations is strengthening propaganda cadres, paying constant attention to their reinforcement with new members, and equipping them with the necessary literature and information.

Present-day national relations, just like any other living matter, engender new problems. The prompt identification of these problems and their solution in conditions of revolutionary restructuring and the expansion of democracy, glasnost, and self-management is becoming especially topical. And the Communists are called upon to play a vanguard role in this. It is necessary to wage a firm and principled struggle against any manifestations of national narrow-mindedness, arrogance, nationalism, and chauvinism, no matter what form they take. Nationalism and proletarian internationalism are two diametrically opposed policies, two diametrically opposed world outlooks. This is stated in the resolution adopted by the aktiv meeting participants.

Nationalistically minded elements and people who do not accept our social system must be made to understand absolutely clearly that they will not be allowed to speak on behalf of the entire Latvian people and to gamble on

what is most dear to them. Democracy, just like the revolution, must be able to defend itself and it will do so in accordance with existing legislation. Let our class enemies entertain no illusions on this account.

The Riga party aktiv meeting was attended by G.N. Loskutov, chief of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee Organizational Party Work Department.

Kaliningrad Obkom Discusses Rural Problems

PM271019 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Oct 87 Second Edition p 2

[Own correspondent T. Karyakina report: "At Different Levels. Notes From Kaliningrad CPSU Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] In September the party Central Committee adopted a resolution "On Serious Shortcomings in the Kaliningrad Oblast Party Organization's Work To Enhance Efficiency in the Utilization of Agricultural Production Potential." An extraordinary obkom plenum devoted to the tasks that the oblast's Communists have to solve in the wake of such exacting criticism was held in Kaliningrad yesterday.

In his report the plenum Obkom First Secretary D.V. Romanin self-critically admitted on behalf of the Bureau members that for decades the oblast party organization had been the captive of convenient stereotypes whenever it came to evaluating the state of affairs in agriculture. "We took small steps forward," the speaker said, "without either standing out in particular, so to speak, or actually bringing up the rear. The prevailing opinion held that it was not worth worrying as long as the oblast fulfilled the procurement plans for basic agricultural products and a certain growth had been achieved. Such a stance encouraged equability among our cadres, accustomed them to a quiet life, and blunted the edge of the problems that had built up in the countryside."

Let us interrupt the quotation and see what sort of problems these were and why it was that, "even though the oblast did not actually bring up the rear," its agricultural affairs became the topic of critical discussion in the party Central Committee. A sum in excess of R1.6 billion was invested in the oblast's agriculture by way of capital investment in the last 11 years, the capital-worker ratio almost doubled, yet the average annual agricultural output increased only 20 percent. A serious lag was allowed to build up in the fulfillment of the Food Program in terms of most types of crop farming and livestock products.

Now it is clear that a strategic error was committed in the choice of economic policy and the setting of priorities in capital investment projects. More than 70 percent of the total volume of allocated funds were channeled into production construction, including more than R300 million into land reclamation. The main construction projects were expensive livestock units. The same spending mechanism also operated in land reclamation: They were chasing vast capital-intensive areas while pushing actual land cultivation well into the background. Thus the extensive approach and the lack of efficiency resulted in the average annual grain yield sticking at 19 quintals per hectare and the potato yield at 80 quintals per hectare. Feed production was also in a state of neglect: The 13 quintals of feed units per standard head of livestock were clearly inadequate to boost milk yields and reach the necessary weight-gain levels.

The incorrect approaches aggravated many problems, but perhaps the main mistake lay in underestimating the development of the social sphere in the countryside. The result was to be expected: Today the availability of medical and children's preschool institutions, schools, and clubs for the rural population is lower than anywhere else in the RSFSR Chernozem Zone. Hence the shortage of people that has developed: There are less than 7 working people per 100 hectares of agricultural land.

And now we have the CPSU Obkom Bureau and its secretariat admitting: They lost their grip on the situation, they failed to provide a prompt political evaluation. In actual fact, the slowing down of renewal, the half-hearted measures, and the marking of time without any weighty addition to production are nothing but the consequences of the slow restructuring of oblast party committees' style and methods of work on the leadership of agricultural production.

This idea in particular rang out in the plenum speech by M.A. Khovanskiy, first secretary of the Slavskiy CPSU Raykom, who believes: Today's tactics for the fulfillment of the Food Program in the oblast are nothing but stopgap tactics. By way of an example, a program for rural housing construction was adopted. Everyone signed this program, though perfectly aware of its obvious vulnerability, because the program lacks the tangible backing of slates, bricks, cement, and nails. "It is our fault that peasants have started losing interest in working the land," Khovanskiy went on. "The party apparatus works with the aktiv and the leaders: We preach to the converted without actually reaching the small stock unit, team, or family. We have not held a single plenum in the last 5 years to analyze the urgent problems that worry the rural population. And yet this is the only approach that can be described as restructuring."

Hero of Socialist Labor I.I. Shurinov, one of the oblast's most senior kolkhoz chairmen, offered his own interpretation of the problem. He attributed the lack of people in the fields mainly to the fact that, as in the past, the independence of kolkhoz chairmen exists only on paper. He would like to build more and halt the exodus of people from the countryside (about 500 people, equivalent to virtually 2 kolkhozes, have left his Pravdinskiy Rayon during the 5-year plan period). But the authority

to spend his kolkhoz' own money is nonexistent, as before. All sorts of people are in charge of that money: the rayon agro-industrial association, the bank, the rayon or oblast bosses...

That was said by someone who built up a village himself, with his own hands and using his own kolkhoz' money. Someone who is known as a personality—and yet even Shurinov finds it difficult. And the result is that the corps of leaders like him is shrinking in the oblast: The last 6 years have seen the replacement of 137 of the 180 kolkhoz chairmen and sovkhoz directors. One-third of those who left had compromised themselves, the rest were swept aside in cadre reshuffles. People were simply unwilling to "ride along" with some of them. Others were detached from lively and specific work and were thoughtlessly transferred to the management apparatus, to paperwork. They lost intelligent economic managers without gaining anything from them in their new capacities. This is what actually happened, for example, with former "Stepnoy" Sovkhoz Director Kalyagin, "Pogranichnik" Kolkhoz Chairman Listratovskiy, and others.

The fact that an intelligent cadres policy and stability in that policy are of decisive importance for boosting the agricultural economy was proved to the plenum participants in the speech by N.G. Troshkin, director of Zelenogradskiy Rayon's "Perelesskiy" Sovkhoz. "Why has our rayon achieved one of the highest economic indicators in the oblast?", he asked the audience, and went on to reply: "We do not play this game of leadership musical chairs, the average length of a kolkhoz chairman's or sovkhoz director's service is about 10 years. And many of them came to the farms with experience in party work.

"But matters are far from perfect in our rayon. I believe that we are still developing in an extensive fashion. We fulfill our meat plans by increasing the head count and the grain plans by increasing the proportion of cultivated land. It was our rayon that initiated these new forms of labor organization, but today not a single one of our farms has the range of machines necessary for intensive technologies. And I think to myself: Where was this R1.6 billion actually invested? Why did this money not take the form of the necessary equipment, of comprehensively developed villages and settlements?"

It is typical that this question was heard in the same hall about 1 year ago, at the time of a party plenum devoted to the question of developing the social sphere in the countryside. A specific program was formulated at that time, its executants and the timetable were specified. Months have passed, however, and five of the oblast's rayons are not coping with their program for housing scheduled for commissioning. The commissioning of a school at "Marshalskiy" Sovkhoz, of kindergartens at the Guryev and "Lesnoy" Sovkhozes, and of houses of culture at the "Trudovik" Sovkhoz, Polesskiy Rayon's Zhdanov Kolkhoz, and Zelenogradskiy Rayon's "Bolshevik" Kolkhoz was thwarted. But not a single one of those specifically guilty of thwarting the work was taken to task at the time.

Virtually every speech sounded the alarm as regards the state of affairs in rural construction. Having requested the floor, Bagrationovskiy Rayispolkom Chairman A. Zabolotnyy, said: "I believe that the oblast lacks an atmosphere of mutual responsibility for the state of affairs in construction. After all we are not building enough not only because we are short of construction materials but also because of lack of coordination between different departments. It is necessary to seek the way out together—together with, for example, the scientists who should have investigated local raw materials a long time ago and adapted them for the production of bricks and other construction materials. I am convinced that the situation can be remedied." The situation can indeed be remedied. This feeling was expressed, in one way or another, by everyone who spoke from the plenum rostrum. If truth be told, not all of the party obkom members who spoke rose to the heights of critical analysis and party interpretation of the situation and of specific businesslike proposals, by no means all of them abandoned the grating self-praising reports that are to be heard increasingly rarely elsewhere. Viewing the plenum from a principled viewpoint, a discussion in the strict sense of the word failed to develop: The obkom first secretary's report and the debate speeches were rarely interrupted, they proceeded along what seemed to be parallel lines. There was a tangible lack of critical pressure, which should have been sensed at a plenum dealing with such an agenda. Despite the evaluations of the party obkom's style and methods of activity contained in the CPSU Central Committee resolution, the speeches did not critically name any obkom officials, Bureau members, or secretaries.

...Each of the plenum participants was issued a draft of a resolution and measures planned to fulfill the CPSU Central Committee resolution. It looks as if no one used this draft when preparing speeches, since no specific additions to and suggestions for the draft were made during the plenum's work.

And so the following question arises: Are these draft documents sufficiently deep, are they so thoroughly elaborated and substantiated? During the break I spoke with E. Loktev, deputy chairman of the Oblast Agro-industrial Committee for construction matters. We discussed one specific fact in particular: It is planned to commission 11 houses annually in every kolkhoz and sovkhoz. Is this realistic? My interlocutor thought about it, then replied that this provision, in his opinion, has not been backed up with resources. This might seem a trivial detail, but it does raise doubts about the program as a whole. After all, the question was asked virtually at random.

In the evening after the plenum, journalists were invited to an exchange of opinions with some of the Obkom Bureau members. Something akin to a "roundtable" discussion took place, with the conversation focusing on the program in question. "We believe," Obkom Secretary Yu.n. Semenov confidently said, "that this program will breathe fresh life into the development of the agro-industrial complex. We tried to make provisions in it for virtually everything, and each of the Bureau members has taken on a specific block of measures for which he is personally responsible. We'll work. The situation will be remedied."

This is what people in Kaliningrad are really waiting for.

Commission Debates Baykal Ecological Ills

PM221301 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 Oct 87 Morning Edition p 6

[Special correspondents V. Sbitnev, L. Filipchenko report: "The Present State of Lake Baykal. Government Commission Sums Up Initial Results of Action Taken on Resolution To Protect Unique Lake"]

[Text] Irkutsk/Baykalsk—A session of the government commission set up to monitor the state of the lake's ecosystem was held recently in Baykalsk. It summed up the initial results of action by ministries, departments, and scientific establishments to fulfill the tasks set by the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on protecting and rationally utilizing Lake Baykal's natural resources. It made a principled assessment of unsatisfactory work by the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification, the USSR Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, and the USSR Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy to prevent the pollution of Lake Baykal and improve the ecological situation on its shores.

The day before the commission began work in Baykalsk, there was a meeting of the city's residents and people who live in population centers in the vicinity of Lake Baykal. The meeting was very well attended and turned out to be stormy: People discussed the ecological situation around the pulp and paper combine. People who have lived by Lake Baykal for a long time, whose lives used to be bound up with the old fishing trade that has now become a thing of the past, and those who have only recently come to live at the lake—pulp production workers and chemists—were unanimous in the opinion that nature must be saved.

The leaders of the Kultuk Bulk Plant, who installed an expensive furnace for burning off waste in such a way that it has not worked for 5 years, were strongly criticized. The waste is simply dumped, then the rain washes it straight into Baykal. Antipollution units have been inoperative for the same length of time at the Slyudyanka plant.

The following examples were also given. Dust and gas filters are not working properly at the pulp and paper combine, and the designers of a proposed pipeline for carrying this combine's industrial waste into the River Irkut have already "sentenced" to death a beautiful pine forest alongside three tourist centers of national status.

But are such bleak predictions not rather premature, perhaps? No, city soviet deputies voted unanimously at their session against this construction. They were supported by a large group of well known Siberian scientists, writers, and cultural figures, whose petition was conveyed to members of the interdepartmental commission.

The first item on the list of measures to implement the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution is to draw up and submit to the government in 1987 a draft general plan for the development of productive forces in the Baykal Basin. Moreover, this document unequivocally indicates the need to strictly observe ecological requirements. It is no accident that the discussion on the report by A. Kurnosov, deputy chairman of the USSR Gosplan Council for the Development of Productive Forces, became particularly pointed when examining the section dealing with the interrelationship between industry and nature. It is a complicated issue, the speaker pointed out, because some people want to keep Baykal's ecosystem in its primordial state, that is, as it was before its industrial colonization by man, while others see nothing catastrophic in the present state of the lake and its environs. The former are demanding tougher control, while the latter are afraid that strict ecological restrictions, which will entail a lot of expense, will "finish off" already inferior local industry.

What we need, the speaker said, are clear, detailed recommendations from ecologists, geographers, and hydrologists in order to draw up a program for the region's socioeconomic development. We need to know exactly what the limits are here, at Lake Baykal, for expanding economic activity.

The USSR Gosplan has received proposals from the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and other organizations and institutions on preparing a draft general plan for developing productive forces in the Baykal Basin. They will help us to select the correct guidelines for restructuring the region's economy. These proposals are being studied in order to submit the finished draft to the government by the end of the year.

The members of the interdepartmental commission asked the speaker whether there are any plans to locate new production units on Lake Baykal. A. Kurnosov said that there are no plans for this kind of construction in the lake's vicinity in the next 10-15 years. A dispute arose at this point: What does "in the lake's vicinity" mean? What sort of distance are we talking about? The question

is far from being an idle one. Angarsk, Usolye-sibirskoye, and Zima are not very far from Baykal and it has been discovered that there are plans to expand existing chemical plants there.

Surely this is an old method, torpedoing a good decision "on the quiet"? Let us cast our minds back: In 1965 the USSR Academy of Sciences Presidium submitted recommendations to the Leningrad State Urban Planning Institute similar to those recently drawn up by the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences. On the basis of these recommendations a general plan for the comprehensive utilization of the lake's natural resources was prepared and sent to the USSR Council of Ministers, whence it later made its way to the USSR Gosplan—and "settled" there forever. In 1979 all this was repeated exactly. Meanwhile, despite academic opinion, nonferrous metallurgical and chemical enterprises were being designed and preparations made to build them in the Baykal basin...

The commission took into consideration the assurances given by A. Kurnosov, the USSR Gosplan representative, that harmful production units will not be built on Baykal in the future.

Reports were then heard from four union ministries: the Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry, the Ministry of Power and Electrification, the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building, and the Ministry of Nonferrous Metallurgy. It must be said that their representatives presented their reports without any particular enthusiasm: They have nothing to boast about at present. For example, power workers were supposed to begin this year a study of the technical and economic feasibility of converting apartment blocks and municipal service facilities in cities and other population centers in the Baykal region to electric heating. This has not been done, unfortunately. Preparatory work has not been done at the site in Ust-ilimsk where units are to be built to compensate for Baykal pulp production. Many Ministry of Power and Electrification enterprises—the Ulan-ude and Irkutsk stations and the Baykalsk and Selenginsk TETS's—release into the atmosphere large quantities of sulfur and nitric oxides and other toxic compounds which carry the danger of pollution over large distances. But sector leaders are in no hurry to equip power stations with effective antipollution units. They blame the manufacturer of these units—the Ministry of Chemical and Petroleum Machine Building. In turn, the latter blames power workers: They do not place their orders for these units within the deadline, apparently...

The report by the USSR Ministry of the Timber, Pulp and Paper, and Wood Processing Industry representative drew special attention. This is understandable: The two pulp combines on Lake Baykal are greatly criticized. According to First Deputy Minister Yu. Guskov, everything is fine in his industry: Preparations are being made to convert the combines and the ecological situation is being improved. His report on the state of affairs at the Ust-ilimsk site almost had a touch of bravura about it: According to him, work is in full swing and R8 million will be assimilated by the end of the year. And all is in harmony with the environment at the Baykalsk Pulp and Paper Combine, apparently.

If only this were really so! We will cite the decision approved by the Baykalsk City Soviet session 18 September: "The air pollution level is still over the limit. It often stems from breaches of technological discipline... The pulp and paper combine administration invariably fails to obey the instructions of monitoring organs... Measures have not been taken to eliminate discharges via roof ventilation, and flotation equipment has not been commissioned." And as far as Ust-ilimsk is concerned, only a few tens of thousands of rubles have been assimilated at the site so far.

At the same time, the sector leader did not feel it necessary to inform the members of the commission that the ministry is increasing the Baykalsk Pulp and Paper Combine's annual output plan by almost 9,000 tonnes. They were eventually told by A. Babuchenko, secretary of the enterprise party committee, but only at the labor collective's insistence.

R. Zaykova, deputy director of environmental protection at the combine, later explained:

"The combine is in no condition to cope with this task: Its equipment is outmoded and needs to be replaced. The increased workload will make it impossible to carry out our reconstruction plans and will involve the consumption of an additional 4 million cubic meters of Baykal water and the release of another 2,000 tonnes of gas and dust into the atmosphere."

Listening to departmental reports, you cannot shake off the feeling that the representatives of these departments are not in full possession of the facts about the situation at local level. To all appearances, many ministries need to carefully record "their own" pollution sources and define the nature of this pollution.

This will be the first step toward doing what Siberian scientists suggest: introducing environmental protection certificates at all enterprises. They will form the basis of a fundamentally new environmental protection policy in the Baykal region.

Presenting a report on the new environmental protection strategy, V. Koptyug, chairman of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences, told us:

"The very formulation of the question as to the quantity of pollutants we can discharge into Lake Baykal or the air above it is unacceptable. We must get out of the pernicious habit of first mutilating nature and then protecting

it. We must attain a new level of ecological thinking and aim for the minimum effect on the environment by employing the latest scientific and technological achievements."

All analysis of the impact of economic activity on Baykal must be raised to a new level: in terms of the scale of information made available, the authenticity of this information, and its scientific validity. With this in mind, the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences organized an exhibition for the commission members and for the participants in a scienctific and practical conference held in parallel, displaying the latest monitoring equipment and instruments for chemically analyzing gases and liquids. The majority of models on display in Baykalsk are unique at present and some of them, according to researchers, have no analogy abroad.

Considering the acute need for research equipment, the interdepartmental commission resolved to ask the USSR Ministry of Instrument Making, Automation Equipment, and Control Systems to organize its series production. It also drew the attention of the Siberian Department of the USSR Academy of Sciences and local organs to the need to form an engineering center of ecological instrument making in either Irkutsk or Krasnoyarsk.

The commission session made a detailed analysis of the state of Baykal's ecosystem and highlighted danger areas. In view of the fact that not every point in the CPSU Central Committee and USSR Council of Ministers resolution on protecting the lake basin has been fulfilled within the stipulated period, the commission made well founded complaints about the ministries which had presented reports and demanded that they fundamentally change their attitude to matters in the Baykal region. Decisions made by the party and the government must be strictly implemented in terms of both letter and spirit.

The leaders of Irkutsk Oblast and the Buryat ASSR have stressed at meetings how greatly the "health" of the lake depends on central departments' attention.

But people must also act at local level! For example, for many years the Buryatstroy Main Administration has prevented the commissioning of antipollution installations in Ulan-ude and held back the construction of a closed water circulation system at the Selenginsk Combine. The reason for this? The material and technical base is weak and there is a shortage of construction workers. This is often discussed at the republic's Supreme Soviet sessions but the situation remains unchanged.

And what prevents the Irkutsk Oblispolkom from bringing order to the lake's shores in the Slyudyanka and Kultuk region, which is cluttered with felled timber, dumps, and slag heaps? All along the shoreline, small industrial and private buildings and bath houses are springing up spontaneously, like toadstools. And all this is happening right under the nose of the local authorities...

Translated into Russian, Baykal means "rich lake." Can we count on it remaining such, given the present form of economic management? The documents of the government commission session provide an unequivocal answer to this question: Alas, we cannot!

Northern Kuriles Volcano Erupts
LD270951 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0910 GMT 27 Oct

[Text] Severo-Kurilsk, 27 Oct (TASS)—The Ebeko Volcano on Paramushir Island began rumbling again today. The eruption has thrown up ash to a height of 1 km.

The volcano, which has been dormant for several years, first became active again 2 weeks ago. Specialists from the vulcanology research institute who arrived o n Paramushir from Kamchatka "diagnosed" that an eruption was coming. There is a danger that a mud-flow will pour out of Ebeko or that the volcano will throw a solid lump of hydrogen sulphide into the atmosphere. But as yet that is just supposition. The "angry" volcano has not caused any damage so far and there have been no casualties.

Vladivostok Seminar Views Philosophy Program
PM191131 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 2 Oct 87 Second Edition p 4

[N. Bratchikov report: "Propaganda Workers' Conference"]

[Text]Vladivostok—An all-union scientific and practical conference entitled "Philosophical (Methodological) Seminars Under the Conditions of Restructuring," organized on the initiative of the CPSU Maritime Kraykom's All-union Political Enlightenment Center, has been held in Vladivostok over 3 days. The participants attended mainly to the problems of shaping a communist outlook in the scientific intelligentsia, the provision of information backup for seminars, and experience in the work of consulting philosophers. Twenty different reports were discussed. The results of the discussion were summed up by V. Stepanov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Political Enlightenment Center.

Kirov's Civil War Action Commemorated
PM210933 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 6 Oct 87 Second Edition p 3

[TASS report: "Monument to Kirov Unveiled"]

[Text] Dzhava (South Osetian Autonomous Oblast) 5 Oct—A monument to Sergey Mironovich Kirov has been unveiled on the eve of the 70th anniversary of Great October in the rayon center of Dzhava. It was 66 years ago that the legendary 11th Army headed by S.M.

Kirov passed through the area. At the request of the Georgian Revolutionary Committee it then came to the assistance of the insurgent mountain dwellers who were struggling to establish Soviet power. Elderly inhabitants of the mountain region—including some who knew Sergey Mironovich personally—laid flowers at the foot of the monument to the ardent revolutionary immortalized in bronze.

BRIEFS:

New CPSU History

Politizdat has brought out a new book for the 70th anniversary of the Great October Socialist Revolution. Entitled "*The Party of the October Revolution: the History of the CPSU in Questions and Answers*" [*Partiya Oktyabrskoy Revolyutsii: Istoriya KPSS v Voprosakh i Otvetakh*], it contains the answers to the most popular questions put to propagandists at seminars and in letters to the press. The book answers more than 40 questions about, for example, differences between the new-style Bolshevik party and the old-style social democratic parties, Lenin proposal that our party be called Communist in the April theses, the essence and international significance of the new economic policy, and the process of collectivization. The publication is also illustrated with documentary photographs and diagrams. [Summary] [*Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0908 GMT 24 Oct 87 LD*]

Economic

Batalin, Silayev Visit Ulyanovsk Project
PM241359 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Oct 87 Single Edition p 4

[TASS report: "Ulyanovsk's Large Construction Project"]

[Text] Ulyanovsk—Ulyanovsk has been chosen as the site for the creation of a major microelectronics center. How is the fulfillment of this important target proceeding? This and other aspects of the city's comprehensive development were discussed at a meeting of the oblast party and economic aktiv.

It was noted that the preparatory work is going to schedule. Sites have been earmarked for the construction of the five scientific research institutes that will make up the center along with experimental plants and residential areas. The best architectural workshops have participated in a competition held at short notice. It produced original projects for production buildings, housing, and cultural and consumer facilities. The city's third panel housing construction plant is being commissioned a year ahead of schedule.

Talking about the extensive scale of the work, the main speaker—V.I. Gurinovich, secretary of the CPSU Obkom—and the other speakers stressed at the same time that the current pace should not turn people's heads and that a great deal of work lies ahead. In particular, one of the main concerns is to set up stable construction collectives consisting of highly skilled specialists.

The Komsomol Central Committee initiative to declare the construction of the Ulyanovsk Microelectronics Center and certain other projects an All-Union Komsomol Shock Construction Project was greeted with approval. Measures aimed at ensuring that the construction industry in Ulyanovsk is sufficiently accurate, well-organized, and mobile were outlined.

Taking part in the meeting's work were Yu.P. Batalin and I.S. Silayev, deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers; L.S. Suslov, deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Construction Department; and senior leaders of a number of ministries and departments.

Silayev at Signing of Cold Plant Deal
PM251501 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 14 Oct 87Second Editionp 6

[V. Vasilev report under the rubric "Cooperation": "Permit Granted"]

[Text] A ceremony has been held at the Moscow International Trade Center for the signing of an agreement on the creation of the "Sovitalprodmash" joint enterprise. The new firm has been granted a permit to operate in the Mari ASSR city of Volzhsk.

But what is "Sovitalprodmash?" It is a large enterprise for manufacturing refrigerators, cold stores, and fast-freezing installations designed for the country's agro-industrial complex, trade, and public catering. Its production capacity is 230,000 units per year. The Ministry of Machine Building for Light and Food Industry and Household Appliances and the Italian firm "Fata European Group" set up the joint enterprise.

"The output of the new enterprise," G. di Rosa, president of the "Fata" firm said, "will ensure the preservation of agricultural and other products without changing their quality or taste attributes. It is planned to start to produce the equipment in the second half of 1989. It will be supplied to the Soviet market, and also to the world market, because both the production setup and the technology are designed to produce refrigerators of a very high quality. This will be the world's largest refrigeration equipment plant....

Soviet and Italian specialists will lead the new enterprise. The new firm has already planned for a group of engineers to start work on developing new prospective models for the coming years.

In his speech at the signing ceremony I.S. Silayev, deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, stressed that the creation of this enterprise also has social significance.

because its output is primarily designed to aid the successful solution of food-industry tasks and improve the supply of food products to the country's population, preserving them using the refrigeration installations from Volzhsk. The new enterprise will have extensive rights, and state aid and support. The main object of its activity is to produce output of the highest quality.

Long-Term, High-Interest Bonds

PM251519 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 14 Oct 87 Single Edition p 4

[S. Kapustin article: "New Types of Investment"—first paragraph is reader's letter]

[Text] I have heard that there will be innovations in the savings bank system in the new year.... Could you discuss them in more detail? D. Tsilyurik. Moscow.

We asked P.I. Zhikharev, chief of the RSFSR Main Administration for USSR State Labor Savings Banks, to answer this question:

"Indeed, as of 1 January 1988 new types of investment will appear. The USSR Savings Bank has already started issuing bearer certificates. These are intended for 10-year deposits, with the interest payable depending on the length of the term. If no withdrawals are made over the 10 years the interest yield will be on the maximum scale of 4% per year.

"The certificates will be issued in denominations of R250, R500, and R1,000.

"Also next year, at the request of working people the USSR Savings Bank will allow adults to make investments on behalf of children up to the age of 16. Those on whose behalf the investment is registered will, on attaining their majority, also be paid the maximum interest of 4%, but only on condition that the investment is retained for 10 years. In the event of early repayment interest will be payable at the rate of 2% per year."

Changes in Statistics Work Outlined

PM261203 Moscow EKONOMICHESKAYA GAZETA in Russian No 42, 8 Oct 87 (Signed to Press 8 Oct 87) p 16

[Article by N. Belov, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, under the rubric "In Connection With Great October's 70th Anniversary": "Statistics: Time for Changes"—passages within double slantlines published as boxed subheads; boldface passages as published]

[Text] On the eve of the 70th anniversary of Great October,it would be appropriate to recall that the history of Soviet statistics goes right back to the first years of Soviet power. We can be proud that V.I. Lenin's name is linked with all the fundamental principles concerning the organization of accounting and statistical work in the socialist state. Lenin's idea of the strategic role of accounting under socialism determined the importance of statistics at all stages of socialist building. Since the foundation of a unified national statistical organ—the Central Statistical Administration—in 1918, statistics has been a component of all-state work and has actively assisted in the solution of all tasks facing the state.

From the very early stages of its development, state statistics has satisfied the needs of the national economy's leadership for the most diverse socioeconomic data and has disseminated statistical knowledge among the broad public. The first Soviet population censuses were conducted, together with studies of industry and agriculture, various institutions, and family budgets. The drawing up of the first national economic balance in 1923-1924 was of exceptional importance.

It was the initial period in the history of Soviet statistics that enjoyed to the full the direct influence of Lenin's ideas, and for this reason it is the most interesting and most topical period today. The rich organizational and methodological arsenal of our statistics also contains achievements in subsequent years: The first 5-year plans, and the period of the Great Patriotic War and postwar development.

Even so, however, now it is clear that in many respects our statistical theory and practice fail to meet the requirements of the new socioeconomic situation in the country and the expansion of glasnost. This is precisely why the party and government adopted the well-known resolutions aimed at changing the situation in this sphere.

//"Accounting and monitoring—these are the main elements required for 'tuning up' and ensuring correct functioning of the first phase of communist society." V.I. Lenin, *Complete Collected Works*, Vol 33, p 101//

Statisticians, just like the entire country, are undergoing restructuring on the move. The setting up of **new statistical organs** is due to be completed everywhere by year's end. It is well-known that the USSR Central Statistical Administration has been reorganized into the USSR State Committee for Statistics, and that decisions have been made to reorganize the union republic central statistical administrations into homonymous state committees.

Administrations for statistics will be set up in all oblasts, krays, and autonomous republics on the base of former statistical administrations and data processing service associations, and departments for statistics will be set up in rayons. Their activity must be organized on the basis of the principles of economic accountability [khozyaystvennyy raschet]. This means that expenses incurred in collecting and processing data must be commensurate with income, in other words, the organization of all statistical work will be raised to a qualitatively new level.

This is, in fact, the emergence of an infrastructure sector called forth by the contemporary needs of society and the development of scientific and technical progress.

It is extremely important to ensure, from the very beginning of operations by the new organs, the well-organized interaction of all economic levers and incentives for the sake of fundamentally improving accounting and statistical work in the country. A fundamental restructuring lies ahead.

We are talking primarily about the need for serious improvement in all statistical methodology and especially the system of general indicators. It is universally known that the prevailing system of value indicators and physical indicators is quite cumbersome and that it is, to a considerable extent, oriented toward a gross-output approach in the evaluation of work results and reflects mainly quantitative features rather than qualitative transformations. This is why **it is necessary to implement a general reform of the entire data provision system to meet the demands of the national economy's state leadership.** This ought to create a standard statistical data system of the country, operated by statistical organs and comprising the totality of methodological, technical, program, and organizational-economic solutions.

Paramount attention in the implementation of this reform must be given to ensuring that statistics reflects a fundamentally new approach toward the evaluation of economic activity by enterprises and associations. Here it is necessary to proceed from the modern conditions of management and economic activity and the statistical description of the progress and efficiency of measures being implemented. It is economic statistics that will require, more than ever before, a broader combination of physical, labor, and value indicators making it possible to ensure the comprehensive study of the economy and balance between its material-commodity and value proportions.

Profound changes will be effected in **social statistics,** where it is planned to pool the dispersed efforts on statistical studies of the social sphere into a unified integrated system. Its basis will be provided by consolidated information about the population compiled on the base of all-union censuses, current statistics, and special social-demographic studies. This will make it possible to introduce in practice indicators which comprehensively reflect the processes of improvement of production, social class, and national relations, development of democracy and self-management, and implementation of the principle of social justice.

The **statistics of foreign economic ties** is to be organized afresh. It must be oriented toward further development of the international division of labor and expansion of the independence of enterprises and association in this sphere. In particular, it is planned to centralize this work in statistical organs and to expand international comparisons. It is necessary to standardize the system of corresponding indicators, and world experience will be utilized for this purpose. Even though much work has been done in the last few years on international value comparisons within the framework of CEMA countries, major opportunities still exist for statistical comparisons on the scale of world economic ties.

In parallel with the restructuring of management, planning, and the economic mechanism, **it is necessary to improve the entire system of state accounts in the national economy and to work constantly on its rationalization, further contraction, and simplification.**

As part of this work, there will be a review of all current instructions on the compilation of accounts, and they will be brought fully into line with the demands of the new economic mechanism and the USSR Law on the State Enterprise (Association).

An important position among measures for the restructuring of the activity of statistical organs is occupied by the **struggle for authenticity and enhancement of data quality.** Numerous instances of overreporting and distortions of accounts continue to exist, though there has been some improvement. This work was assisted by the CPSU Central Committee October 1986 resolution "On the Unsatisfactory Fulfillment of CPSU Central Committee Decisions on the Eradication of Window Dressing and Overreporting by the Moldavian Communist Party Central Committee, the Kirovograd Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom, and the USSR Ministry of the Automotive Industry."

But the situation remains very alarming in many republics and oblasts. This year, for example, overreporting was revealed at 18% of installations inspected in the Kabardino-Balkar ASSR, 16.6% of installations in Kiev, and 31.3% of installations in Samarkand Oblast. We hope that the coordination of work on the inspection of state accounts at all levels of economic management, recently assigned to statistical organs, will make it possible to wage a considerably more effective struggle against this phenomenon. It is, however, necessary to realize that this will also demand a corresponding restructuring of monitoring activity.

The work on ensuring authenticity of accounts must be increasingly oriented toward preventive measures and the stepping up of economic methods of monitoring the end results of the activity of enterprises and organizations. In addition to this, it is necessary to create an atmosphere of universal intolerance of false accounting, and such instances and the measures taken with regard to them must be discussed without fail. This requires broader use of the mass news media and greater glasnost in all instances of overreporting and window dressing.

//"...Statewide bookkeeping and statewide accounting for the production and distribution of products is, so to speak, something like the skeleton of socialist society." V.I. Lenin, *Complete Collected Works*, Vol 34, p 307//

One of the specific features of the monitoring activity by statistical organs is the detection of so-called false accounts and the prevention of the gathering of all sorts of unnecessary data.

Unfortunately, this "paperwork carousel" still cannot be brought to a successful standstill. One could cite quite a few instances of ministries getting carried away with gathering data "just in case, requesting daily returns and reports having nothing to do with the actual requirements of production.

In 1986 alone our system detected and canceled 28,000 forms of false accounts, and more than 10,000 such forms in the first 6 months of this year. Much data of this kind is being gathered within the systems of the USSR State Agro-industrial Committee, the Ministry of Railways, the Tsentrosoyuz, the USSR Ministry of Trade, and the construction industry complex ministries.

Profoundly thought out, systematic, and authentic statistical data will make it possible to seriously **improve the economic analysis** produced by statistical organs, which determines the entire essence of accounting and statistical work. We have to resolutely abandon concern with trivialities and superficial approaches and must concentrate attention on problems concerning the implementation of the strategy of acceleration, comprehensive intensification of social production, and proportionality and balance in the economy.

It is planned to introduce as of next year, jointly with planning organs, the practice of compiling major economic reviews describing the state of the economy and its sectors and regions and the solution of the most important national economic problems.

Statistical organs must step up collaboration with other central economic organs in questions concerning the comprehensive study of socioeconomic problems and supply them with the necessary data and—and this is particularly important—forecasts. Great importance in this work will attach to the newly set up Economic Council, which has been assigned the task of examining major national economic problems, compiling comprehensive programs for the economy's development, elaborating coordinated positions when drawing up draft state plans, and implementing measures for the improvement of the economic mechanism.

//"Socioeconomic statistics is one of the most powerful tools of social knowledge...." V.I. Lenin, *Complete Collected Works*, Vol 19, p 334//

In the conditions of implementing the party's course of all-around development of socialist democracy, the further **improvement of information available to the population** emerges as one of the most important tasks of statistical organs.

Within this framework, it is necessary to substantially expand glasnost in statistical information and to step up the information-propaganda activity of our system. For this purpose, it is necessary to organize the regular publication of statistical handbooks on main sectors of the national economy, union republics, krays, and oblasts, as well as special topic anthologies on the most important economic and social problems.

In 1988, therefore, as well as the annual statistical handbook *"USSR National Economy" [Narodnoye Khozyaystvo SSSR]* and the short handbook *"The USSR in Figures" [SSSR v Tsifrakh]*, we will publish the statistical handbooks *"USSR Agriculture," "Capital Construction in the USSR," "Labor in the USSR," "Consumer Goods,"* and *"Population of the USSR."* We have already organized new forms of information like press releases for newspapers, journals, radio, and television. As a rule, they are prepared on a daily basis.

Substantial improvement is needed in the supply of statistical material to scientific research organizations and VUZ's. We perceive this as an important condition for enhancing the efficiency of social science and especially economic studies.

In order to tackle this work, an information and publications center has been set up under the USSR State Committee for Statistics. It has been assigned the task of publishing statistical material, supplying statistical material to mass news media and to scientific and educational institutions, and organizing conferences and other events. We hope that this center will become the organizing nucleus of all information-propaganda work in the sphere of statistics.

Larger Role for Cooperative System Urged

PM261541 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 3 Oct 87 Morning Edition p 3

[I. Kruglyanskaya interview with Doctor of Historical Sciences V.P. Dmitrenko under the "Viewpoint" rubric: "Small Store or Cooperative?"; boldface passages as published; first paragraph is editorial introduction]

[Text] Various cooperatives are springing up now and there are varying attitudes toward them. And understandably so: The form of activity is new. Yet, is it new? And is it a coincidence that now more often than ever before people are recalling the economic practices of the twenties? Are they rereading Lenin's works of those years? Listening to arguments apropos the emergent cooperative movement, we asked ourselves the question: What of interest could "a man of that time" have to say about it? And so we turned to a historian. Doctor of

Historical Sciences Prof V.P. Dmitrenko, leading scientific fellow of the USSR Academy of Sciences' USSR History Institute and researcher into the economic policy of the twenties.

[Kruglyanskaya] Vladimir Petrovich, are you following the present cooperative movement? What comparisons can be drawn with the economic practice of the twenties?

[Dmitrenko] Very insignificant ones. And, to be honest, I do not quite understand those publicists, litterateurs, and economists who have suddenly taken it upon themselves to write about the New Economic Policy [NEP], showing a rosy picture of the economy's rapid rise and revival. All this did, of course, happen. But there is also another side to historical experience. By unfettering people's initiative the NEP revealed the state's economic weakness. We could not give the private trader and the peasant the requisite quantity of credits and industrial goods. And the quicker we embarked on the NEP the sooner it revealed the contradictions between the state's capabilities and the potentiality of capitalist and small-scale production. In 1926 there was a commodity famine. In 1927, a grain strike, when the countryside began to manifest dissatisfaction with the economic policy: high taxes, disadvantageous prices... The grain strike objectively led, in the course of the class struggle, to collectivization. So it too was a result of NEP! Thus in addressing historical experience it is necessary to see not only the positive, otherwise we condemn ourselves to new complications.

[Kruglyanskaya] There are already more than enough complications. And contradictions are coming to light—labor organization and remuneration in cooperatives are badly coordinated with the administrative apparatus' work style, with its requirements and rules. People are continually writing, calling, and visiting the editorial office—I cannot enumerate all the problems. One thing is forbidden, another thing is allowed; criminal proceedings have already been instituted (to verify somebody's suspicions, as it later turned out), and many people have been closed down for the most incomprehensible reasons....

[Dmitrenko] This must happen if the very principle itself of cooperation is violated (or to put it more mildly: is not fully implemented). For cooperation must above all serve the interests of those who join the cooperative. The current of interests must proceed from there, from below; the enthusiasm must come from there. What is the difference between the present time and the twenties? Lenin said that cooperation is primarily born of the interests of small-scale production and that it serves the latter, elevates, and consolidates it, and that in the process of elevation and consolidation we can control it. That is, he proceeded from the principle: first **there**, then **here**. We, however, are proceeding on the basis that **we**, the state, do not have enough, things are not turning out well **for us**, the consumer **here** is not satisfied and we are looking for someone to satisfy this interest. Meanwhile if the movement proceeds from below, genuine initiative and commitment will appear. But if the interest of the city or the rayon "descends" into cooperation, then it will inevitably fall into the framework of what is permitted. But the framework is determined not by those who are creating the cooperation but by those who permit it. Thus, rigid but unspecified restrictions which make it difficult for this form of activity to develop are presupposed from the start.

[Kruglyanskaya] But all the same, the state must exercise control....

[Dmitrenko] Indisputably. But control of an independent organization. Such is the nature of cooperation that it can keep itself stable and steady only by feeding on the personal interest of the people of which it is made. If we keep the cooperative blinkered with directives, instructions, and orders, it means that we are not yet relating to cooperation in earnest.

[Kruglyanskaya] But, you agree, an unfamiliar path demands caution. In giving free rein are you sure that cooperatives of the type founded by Ostap Bender and company will not appear?

[Dmitrenko] Are you talking about "Roga i Kopyty"? That is not a cooperative, it is a small store [the Russian word used here and in the title, "lavochka," can also be used colloquially to mean "a shady business"]. And present cooperatives, you will forgive me, are also at the present "small stores." By their nature they fall completely into the category of "individual labor activity." But the collective acts in place of the individual. But the principle is the same, because there is no cooperative principle, no appeal to the masses, no concern for the real needs of the population. Today the cooperative's interest lies only in receiving a profit. Yet is this really the aim of cooperation? No, how much profit it receives is not its merit. Nor is it even how much and what it produces. The main thing is how many people it will be able to involve. Because cooperation is above all a means of harmonizing nationwide and personal interests. It is a channel through which the interests of the masses must be satisfied. And what are the prospects today for the participation of the masses?

[Kruglyanskaya] Forgive me, but I haven't understood a thing. But, say, how do you, professor, or I as a journalist, or my neighbors, engineers—how can we all participate in cooperation?

[Dmitrenko] At present we are really acting only as consumers. And the cooperative sells us what it wants to. But I can present my personal account to the cooperative if I contemplate my own gain through cooperation. Of course, if the worse comes to worst I am satisfied with the shirt made by the state enterprise. But I am acutely upset by the problem of food products, their quality, range, delivery times, and whether I stand in line for them or buy them without standing in line. Every

Tuesday our institute puts in its orders. But they only bring one-half of what I need. So why not invest my share, any money accumulated from the entire institute (or a group of institutes, or even from the entire Academy of Sciences) and create a cooperative which would meet for our requirements? In the villages, for example, the population has potatoes—let the cooperative buy and transport them. Or apples. Yes, that is a good idea!

[Kruglyanskaya] Have you suggested this in the institute?

[Dmitrenko] No, for example, I...

[Kruglyanskaya] And what if you had suggested it?

[Dmitrenko] Well, they would have burst out laughing.... We are not used to this. We do not see the real economic advantage.

[Kruglyanskaya] But would they permit such a cooperative?

[Dmitrenko] If they allow a cafe, then why would they not allow this? For it is not forbidden by law but by the absence of a law. By limited thinking. We have grown accustomed to organizing everything and cannot imagine that life itself can dictate. I was talking to a lawyer recently. I said: Before galvanizing the cooperative policy it is necessary to announce that cooperation is independence. He could not understand what I was talking about. He was so used to us permitting, allowing, regulating, and providing incentives, that the very idea of independence is quite alien to his comprehension.

[Kruglyanskaya] And to mine too.... What are all we children of our time to do? Well, all right, let us proclaim that the cooperative means independence. It is understandable that a vigorous chain reaction will begin here. One cooperative will give rise to dozens, for such is its nature. A building needs to be repaired, for example. Inclusion in the repair and construction administration plan is the whole point. A construction workers' cooperative will necessarily appear! Then the need will arise to do up the building—here a cooperative of painters and decorators will offer you their services. It is necessary to transport products—a transport cooperative....

[Dmitrenko] Things turn out as they should: A system of economic links which will guarantee the cooperative's vital activity. Just as a multitude of people mind one patient in a sanatorium, so the cooperative has various ties which must be studied and legalized. If there is, say, cooperative trade, it means that there must also be cooperative transport. How will I ship products? I cannot buy gasoline at the retail price, I would go bankrupt on the shipments. But I am making efforts not for myself but for society, so there must be benefits. They existed in the twenties, for the cooperative was fulfilling a social function. Or cooperative cafes: If they exist, that means that there must be cooperatives producing products for them. Now I know that cooperative workers in Moscow buy meat at the market. Some buy 50, and others 100 kg per day. Three tonnes per month. Several thousand more cooperatives will appear and the market will be exhausted. Or prices will inflate to R10-15 per kilogram. But why not, with the money earned by public catering cooperatives, set up a farm to supply them with meat, vegetables, and other things?

Furthermore. Each economic form presupposes its own type of financing. So why are we questioning cooperatives and yet are silent about the cooperative bank? Where, say, is a cooperative worker to put his profit if it is large? In his pocket? It is terrible that you incur suspicions. The question of expanding production and of subsidiaries has, as far as I know, not yet been resolved. Put it in a moneybox? But he ought to invest the money in a cooperative bank which would use it and invest in other enterprises or sectors. The bank is also above all necessary to accumulate cooperative capital and legalize it, which is of fundamental importance. The money earned must work. In the interests of the cooperative and in the interests of society. But now the economic chain is broken. It comprises only the enterprise itself, its economic links, and income for personal use.

Meanwhile just what types of enterprises arose in the twenties within the framework of cooperation! Let us recall merely the Siberian dairy cooperation. This was of major economic value, it involved the Siberian peasantry, and had its own enterprises for processing, storing, and transporting butter and selling it abroad. It not only supplied the population but also bought certain products from it. Thus, the economic chain was arranged very efficiently; the complete economic cycle was ensured every time, and the resources accumulated by cooperation were not all spent on subsistence but went to expand the business.

This was working profit. And now cooperative money must work for society. It is necessary to expand production where there is profit and demand, and it is necessary to organize contacts with other enterprises for the delivery of raw materials, semimanufactures, and manufactured articles, and to create something alongside the basic product....

[Kruglyanskaya] All this is, of course, logical. And tempting.... Only it is difficult to relate this to today's state of affairs. I listen to you speaking about this sort of scope but I myself am under the impression gained from conversations with cooperative workers—I had to have many meetings with them prior to and after the publication of the essay "Rumors" (*Izvestiya* No 248). By the way, I wrote it under the notional title... "Fear." Because this combination of enthusiasm, commercial fervor, and uncertainty in tomorrow among cooperative workers had an impact on me. Literate people. They obviously recall the fate of the "Nepmen." And the fact that later, after the elimination of industrial cooperation, some people had also to go far away from home....

[Dmitrenko] This is all correct. Today a cooperative worker must be afraid because no one has as yet told him how far this is all reliable. The restrictions, the indeterminateness of the measures, and the lack of study of the theory do not inspire confidence. Furthermore, now a cooperative worker is "exposed," for each cooperative stands alone and there is no cooperative public with a vested interest in its own real material contributions and benefit standing behind it. There is no cooperative system standing behind it. With the present practice of cooperation we are, in my opinion, repeating the history of the kolkhozes, which remained cooperatives only in the work of theorists. Each kolkhoz comes to the state for policy on planning, financing, marketing, supply, credit, and so on. It cannot rely on its neighbor or on the kolkhoz community. And we have reproduced this very system with cooperatives, forgetting that it gave rise to the lack of efficiency in kolkhoz production.

But cooperation was still of particular interest for Lenin as a means of protecting the interests of the cooperative worker. An independent system of cooperative relations, a sort of pyramid, was created in the twenties: a grassroots society, county, province, republic, and all-union association. Thus, a structured, centralized system which united and, when necessary, protected the interests of cooperation was raised over independent economic activity. The agricultural union [selskosoyuz] united peasant cooperation. The handicraft cooperative united the handicraft industry. Tsentrosoyuz incorporated consumer cooperation (under Lenin, Tsentrosoyuz was one of the leading people's commissariats in terms of political and economic importance). There was cooperative legislation, cooperative credit, insurance, and so on. And today cooperation must obligatorily grow into a structured system, otherwise the cooperative worker will continually come up against obstacles.

[Kruglyanskaya] To all appearances we are not yet ready for this. We fear growth and strengthening. We are afraid of independent activity, and thus, naturally, of developing cooperation. And this is not unwarranted, apparently?

[Dmitrenko] We are afraid of what we do not know. Before being afraid it is necessary to see that this is the case.

[Kruglyanskaya] But Hungary and other socialist countries have already seen...

[Dmitrenko] And they have shown that socialism is compatible with this. But if socialism looks at this seriously and with respect.

[Kruglyanskaya] But if we are honest: Aren't you roused into making a protest by the fact that a cooperative trader's earnings are higher than yours, a doctor of sciences?

[Dmitrenko] Earnings? It seems to me that if they are excessively large then my wrath should be directed not at the cooperative worker but at the official who was powerless to prevent it. There can be no exorbitant earnings in the presence of correct economic relations. For we have experience in using a system of control developed by the practice of the twenties—the practice of regulating prices, taxes, credits, commodity supply, and so on. There is a whole system of economic and administrative levers which in the process of growth can regulate income. This is large because we have still not mastered the process. We have lost the art of thinking in terms of the economics of market relations. Of course, in the twenties there existed management skills borrowed from capitalism. After several years of "war communism" a system of institutes which was supposed to control and regulate all this promptly sprang up again. But during the thirties through the seventies it was destroyed. We have no skills, a tax system has not been perfected, we have long since ceased to study the market as it should be studied—market conditions, demand, proposals, status of prices, and competition. Therefore we do not have a viable system of control, and a sensible cooperative worker is placed in such conditions whereby he either has to work halfheartedly or start concealing his income.

[Kruglyanskaya] So do you see a potential lawbreaker in every entrepreneur? For this viewpoint also exists.

[Dmitrenko] Do you see that I do not preclude that in the final analysis the aim of this entrepreneur is to profit at my expense. But on the other hand he gives me conveniences which I would not receive without him, so therefore I think that his existence is necessary and I must proceed on the basis of this viewpoint. In the twenties there were private traders and the state knew that they were swindling at every step. But it tolerated this and effected such control as to make matters advantageous both for people and for the state. Now too it is necessary to build control methods beforehand into the system of cooperative policy and not to be afraid that tomorrow someone will start swindling. And so it turns out that he is afraid and we are afraid. But if we are afraid, and if we compress the framework instead of releasing and legalizing everything, then an acute shortage and high earnings are unavoidable, the result not only of his enterprising nature but also of our sluggishness.

[Kruglyanskaya] You know, I have had occasion to talk about this subject with many people—economists, lawyers, soviet officials. And although almost all are "in favor," everyone expressed certain misgivings. But you, it seems, do not see any dangers in the cooperative movement. Is the drift of people away from production not a danger?

[Dmitrenko] First, people will be going not just anywhere but to work. And to work better than they work now, too. Second, today there is a labor shortage, but

tomorrow, when our economy has been restructured, it is not ruled out that there will be a surplus, and the cooperative system can become a unique kind of safety valve. Third, cooperatives fulfill mainly service functions, so specialists from the service sphere go there. And so certain elements of the established system of trade, consumer service, and public catering really may be undermined. But are these systems so perfect that we must feel sorry for them? So what is there to fear?

No, if we have already embarked on this track then we have to take the next steps. The main concern now is to say out loud: The cooperative system is characteristic of socialism. We have for so long banished it from the concept of socialism, from the vocabulary itself, that we still have to get used to the fact that we can accommodate both the term itself and the economic form of the cooperative—as a form of self-motivated activity, as a form of the reflection of group or personal interests.

Our problem (this is now obvious to me) is that in our move toward communism from pre- and early-capitalist relations we bypassed an entire series of objectively-determined economic forms. The cooperative system is the lowest stage on this path. Corporation (that is, the collective ownership of the means of production). [sentence as published] There must also be some intermediate stages. And only then, at some advanced stage of development of these actual collectivist forms of management, is ownership by the whole people to be asserted. But we were forced to complete the transition to it directly, transferring to the most advanced form of ownership the low level of culture, consciousness, skills, and management ability. Hence the difficulties which must be overcome. In particular, overcome by using the stages of development of the economy which we omitted. The twenties have shown that the cooperative system can exist equally alongside the state and take on a whole range of important national economic functions. Retail trade was at that time shouldered by the cooperative system. Small-scale industry as well. I believe that today too our everyday needs can be completely ensured by a cooperative system which by its very nature immediately becomes the mirror of our changing requirements and will react quickly to these changes and satisfy our demand.

True, the present practice has already shown that the advent of the cooperative system will certainly give rise to a definite struggle of opinions and to contradictions. But historical experience persuades us that they are surmountable inasmuch as the cooperative system, as well as ownership by the whole people, reflects the basic interests of the working people. Now, evidently, it is up to economic science, which must define the role and place of the cooperative system in our life. It is impossible to build socioeconomic relations competently without promoting the concept. In general we must accumulate more rapidly the experience of noncentralized, nonlimited economic relations, for only then will the cooperative system enter our life quickly and organically as an equal form of socialist management.